# REPORT RESUMES

ED 014 239 56 EM 006 017

A STUDY OF THE CRITICAL REQUIREMENTS FOR DIRECTORS IN EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION STATIONS.

BY- ADKINS, GALE R.

KANSAS UNIV., LAWRENCE

REPORT NUMBER NDEA-VIIA-1360 PUB DATE APR 67

REPORT NUMBER BP-6-0430

GRANT OEG-7-26-0430-295

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$6.20 153P.

DESCRIPTORS- *EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION, *TELEVISION RESEARCH, *ADULTS, *JOB ANALYSIS, *BEHAVIOR PATTERNS

THIS RESEARCH STUDY WAS DESIGNED TO ANSWER 3 QUESTIONS CONCERNING THE DIRECTION AND DIRECTORS OF EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION STATIONS--(1) WHAT ELEMENTS OF DIRECTOR BEHAVIOR APPEAR MOST OFTEN IN JUDGMENTS OF DIRECTOR EFFECTIVENESS MADE BY TV STATION MANAGEMENT PERSONNEL, (2) WHAT ARE THE NON-BEHAVIORAL CHARACTERISTICS (I.E., AGE, EDUCATION, WORK EXPERIENCE) OF THE DIRECTORS NOW EMPLOYED IN A SAMPLE GROUP OF EDUCATIONAL TV STATIONS, (3) WHAT JOB ACTIVITIES ARE EXPECTED OF THE DIRECTORS NOW EMPLOYED IN A SAMPLE GROUP OF EDUCATIONAL TV STATIONS. DATA WAS COLLECTED FROM MANAGEMENT PERSONNEL AND FROM 73 DIRECTORS IN A SAMPLE OF 13 MIDWESTERN EDUCATIONAL TV STATIONS. PERSONAL INTERVIEWS WERE CONDUCTED IN THE STATIONS AND THE CRITICAL INCIDENT TECHNIQUE, A JOB ANALYSIS CHECKLIST, AND A PERSONAL DATA FORM WERE USED. OF THE 310 CRITICAL INCIDENTS COLLECTED, 69 PERCENT INVOLVED PERSONAL QUALITIES OF THE DIRECTOR AS THE CRITICAL BEHAVIOR. THE REMAINING 31 PERCENT OF THE INCIDENTS INVOLVED PROFESSIONAL KNOWLEDGE AND COMPETENCE. STATEMENTS OF CRITICAL REQUIREMENTS WERE FORMULATED. JOB ANALYSIS DATA AND DESCRIPTIVE CHARACTERISTICS OF THE DIRECTORS ARE PRESENTED IN 29 TABLES. (MS)

ED014239

BR-6-0430
PA 56

FINAL REPORT
Project No. 1360
Grant No. OE-7-26-0430-295

EM006017

# A STUDY OF THE CRITICAL REQUIREMENTS FOR DIRECTING IN EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION STATIONS

Gale R. Adkins
Principal Investigator

The Project Reported Herein was Supported by a Grant
From the U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Office of Education, Bureau of Research

The University of Kansas
Lawrence, Kansas
April, 1967

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

# A STUDY OF THE CRITICAL REQUIREMENTS FOR DIRECTORS IN EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION STATIONS

Project No. 1360
Grant No. OE-7-26-0430-295

Gale R. Adkins
Principal Investigator

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant with the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

The University of Kansas
Lawrence, Kansas
April, 1967

EM006 017

# ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The extensive personal interviews involved in the collection of data for this study led to substantial debts of gratitude. The station managers, program directors, and other management personnel in the 13 educational television stations were without exception helpful, interested, and generous with their time during the collection of incidents. Interviews with station directors were efficiently and graciously arranged. The 73 directors from whom personal data were collected were also cooperative in every way. It is sincerely hoped that the results of this research will in some way be useful or beneficial to all those who helped to provide information.

Gratitude must be expressed to those who supplied certain key services during the processing of data. Zoel Parenteau, manager of Station KCSD, Kansas City, Missouri, served as the second classifier of critical incidents. Jeff Bangert, statistical analyst, University of Kansas Computation Center, advised concerning the computer processing of data. Paula Adkins attended to the coding of data and many tabulation and verification procedures.

The facilities and services of the University of Kansas Computation Center were invaluable in the treatment of data involved in the study.

Names in a list of acknowledgments must be limited. Appreciation of the services of those who have helped with this project does not, however, end with the list.

Gale R. Adkins
Director
Radio-Television Research

The University of Kansas
April, 1967

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . ii

LIST OF TABLES . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . iv

CHAPTER

I. INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 1
Significance of the Problem . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 2
Objectives of the Study . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 6
Procedures and Scources of Data . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 7
Limitations of the Study . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 8
Definition of Terms . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 10

II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Research Studies . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 12
Textbook Material . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 30

III. METHOD AND PROCEDURE OF THE STUDY

The Sample Group of Stations . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 51
The Critical Incident Technique: A Brief Description . . 53
The Nature of the Critical Incident Technique . . . . . . 55
The Use of the Critical Incident Technique in this Study . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 65
The Personal Data Form and Its Use . . . . . . . . . . . . 69
The Job Analysis Checklist and Its Use . . . . . . . . . . 69

IV. PRESENTATION OF DATA

The Respondents . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 71
Classification of Critical Incidents . . . . . . . . . . . 72
Personal Data Pertaining to the Directors . . . . . . . . . 77
What Directors Do in Educational Television Stations . . 99

V. ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

The Critical Incidents . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 106
Statements of Critical Requirements . . . . . . . . . . . . 116
Personal Data Pertaining to the Directors . . . . . . . . . 119
The Job Duties of Directors . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 123

VI. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 126
Conclusions . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 128

REFERENCES . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 135

APPENDIX . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 138

# LIST OF TABLES

| Table | | Page |
|---|---|---|
| I. | Data Supplied by Management Concerning Duties of Directors . | 23 |
| II. | The Titles of Respondents and the Numbers and Percentages of Incidents Provided . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | 72 |
| III. | Distribution and Percentage of Incidents Falling in the Areas of Classification . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | 73 |
| IV. | Sex of Directors in the Sample of Stations . . . . . . . . . . | 77 |
| V. | Job Titles of Persons Directing Programs in the Sample Stations . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | 78 |
| VI. | Age of Directors in the Sample of Stations . . . . . . . . . . | 79 |
| VII. | Number and Percentage of Directors Who Devote Full Time or Part Time to Directing . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | 79 |
| VIII. | Number and Percentage of Directors Who Serve as Producers . | 80 |
| IX. | Number and Percentage of Directors With Non-Directing Duties . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | 80 |
| X. | Non-Directing Duties of Directors in the Sample of Stations. | 81 |
| XI. | Number of Years of College Completed by Directors in the Sample of Stations . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | 82 |
| XII. | Years in Which Directors in the Sample Last Attended College | 83 |
| XIII. | Highest Degree Held by Directors in the Sample of Stations . | 84 |
| XIV. | Number and Percentage of Directors Who Completed Either an Undergraduate Major or a Graduate Major in Broadcasting . | 84 |
| XV. | Last Major Field Studied in College by the Directors in the Sample . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | 85 |
| XVI. | Number of Years Directors Were Employed in Radio . . . . . . | 85 |
| XVII. | Areas of Past Employment in Radio Which Were Reported by the Directors . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | 86 |
| XVIII. | Starting Jobs of Directors at the Station of Current Employment . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | 87 |
| XIX. | Number of Years Each Director Has Been Employed at the Station of Current Employment . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | 88 |

Table Page

XX. Number of Years Each Director Has Served as a Director at the Station of Current Employment . . . . . . . . . . . . 89

XXI. Number of Commercial Television Stations in Which Each Director Has Been Employed . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 90

XXII. Number of Educational Television Stations in Which Each Director Has Been Employed . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 90

XXIII. Jobs in Television Besides Director or Producer-Director Which Have Been Held by the Directors in the Sample, Including Current Job Assignments . . . . . . . . . . . . 91

XXIV. Number of Years Each Director Has Been Employed in Television . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 92

XXV. Number of Years of Directing Experience Reported by the Directors . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 93

XXVI. Number of Years of Past Employment Outside Television and Radio Reported by the Directors . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 94

XXVII. Areas of Past Employment Outside Television and Radio Reported by the Directors . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 95

XXVIII. Number of Shows Directed Per Week by the Directors in the Sample . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 96

XXIX. Proportion of Shows Directed Which Were Produced by the Directors in the Sample . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 96

XXX. Number and Percentage of Directors That Named Certain Aspects of the Directing Job as Least Desirable . . . . . 97

XXXI. Number and Percentage of the Directors That Named Certain Areas of Training or Background as Most Desired . . . . . 98

XXXII. Work Activities of Directors in the Sample of Educational Television Stations . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 100

XXXIII. Distribution of Critical Incidents Among the Main Categories 108

XXXIV. Distribution of Good and Bad Critical Incidents According to Main Categories . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 111

XXXV. Main Categories of Incidents Classified as Involving Either Personal Qualities or Professional Knowledge and Competence . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 114

XXXVI. Point-Biserial Correlation Values Between Involvement in Good and Bad Incidents and Certain Descriptive Characteristics of Directors . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 123

# A STUDY OF THE CRITICAL REQUIREMENTS FOR DIRECTORS IN EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION STATIONS

## CHAPTER I

## INTRODUCTION

### A. Statement of the Problem.

The television director has one of the most demanding jobs in the broadcasting industry. Whether in an educational station or in a commercial station, in a large station or in a small one, the television director is the person who bears immediate responsibility for the effectiveness, acceptability, and split-second presentation of locally originated broadcast material. Often the director functions in the dual role of producer-director, and then his job may begin with the assignment to build a television program. In such instances the formulation of a program plan, selection and organization of content, scripting, selection and direction of talent, preparation of staging and production materials, and rehearsal may be the director's responsibilities to do or delegate and supervise before he directs the on-the-air presentation. Stasheff and Bretz, two experienced directors and authors of texts on television broadcasting, have said, "It is understandable why some workers in this field have said that the ideal television director will be hard to find, since he should have six pairs of eyes, several voices, and a few extra hands. . . ."[1]

Examination of textbooks on broadcasting or observation of television station operations soon establishes the fact that the director's job is an exacting and complicated one. However, the question of specifically what personal traits and areas of knowledge and skill are necessary for success as a television director is seldom given comprehensive coverage in the literature. Advice on this subject has usually been based on limited personal experience, observation or opinion rather than on extensive and specific research. The small amount of research that has been done and nearly all of the literature deals with directing in the commercial television situation rather than with the director in an educational television station.

---

[1] Edward Stasheff and Rudy Bretz, The Television Program: Its Writing, Direction and Production (New York: A. A. Wyn Inc., 1951), pp. 215-216.

This study is concerned with the field of educational television, and the focus is on directing in ETV stations. The research was designed to produce information about the qualifications that are most important for successful employment as a director in an ETV station; information about the directors who are now working in ETV stations; and information about the job activities that those directors are expected to perform.

## B. Significance of the Problem.

Many young people are preparing for employment in broadcasting through study at colleges and universities. Niven reported that in 1965-66 a total of 185 colleges and universities offered instruction in radio-television, and 132 of these offered a major or degree in broadcasting.[1] Although television directing is not usually a "starting job," many of the thousands of students of broadcasting look forward to television directing as a vocational objective. An ever increasing number of these graduates are finding employment as directors in educational television.

---

[1] Harold Niven, Radio Television Degree Programs in American Colleges and Universities: Tenth Report (Washington, D. C.: National Association of Broadcasters, 1966), p. 1.

The job of television director is one of authority, great creative challenge, and attractive salary scale. Other employees in production frequently hope to advance to a directing assignment where they can put to test their own ideas about good programs. Directors draw top salaries in the production area and command higher starting salaries than do writers and announcers.[1]

The field of employment for television directors is relatively large because directing jobs exist in nearly every commercial and educational television station. Typically some station employees are full-time directors, whereas others direct part-time and perform other duties. A study conducted by the writer in 1958 showed that in a six state region in the south the mean average number of directors employed per commercial station was two full-time and two part-time directors.[2]

Because many young people are trying to prepare for the opportunities in television directing, educators need to know what qualifications are required for success in this employment. Inventories of job activities performed by television directors are useful in advising and curriculum planning, but such lists in themselves do not provide sufficient guidance. Success on the job may involve factors other than competence in handling production materials and manipulating equipment.

In an earlier study by the writer, 189 commercial television station managers responded to the question, "What are the most common reasons that new employees fail to give satisfaction on the job?" Personal qualities were the key in 82.6 per cent of the reasons, whereas 16.2 per cent of the reasons had to do with matters of skill, knowledge or performance peculiar to television.[1] Apparently, criteria for success in television must go beyond competence in handling the equipment, materials and procedures of television production.

---

[1] Sherman P. Lawton, The Modern Broadcaster (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1961), pp. 11-12.

[2] Gale R. Adkins, A Study of Job Activities of Directors in Commercial Television Stations (Lawrence: Radio-Television Research, The University of Kansas, 1961), p. 5.

The insightful advice of experienced television directors is of assistance to educators and students alike. However, such advice as to the preparation and qualifications needed by the aspiring television director is usually influenced by the personal background of the adviser. Directors who have come from a theatre background tend to feel that the theatre is the only proper training ground for directors. Directors who have had long experience in motion picture production often feel that movie work gives the best background for television directing. Directors who have transferred from radio jobs into television have their own opinions. Directors who have been performers have another viewpoint. Those engaged in training broadcasting majors can draw useful information from such personal recommendations, but a more broadly based and objective set of guideposts is to be desired.

Much too often the advice offered in textbooks and in articles written by veteran directors reflects the unique world of a metropolitan production center or a national network. Descriptions of the procedures involved in directing network television or dramatic programs make fascinating reading.

---

[1] Gale R. Adkins, What Is Important for the Success of a New Employee in Television? Part I. A Study of Statements by Station Managers (Lawrence: The University of Kansas, 1959), p. 27.

But even a slight acquaintance with television stations of average size makes clear the fact that production there is very different from what it is in the network studios or in the largest stations. Most faculty members recognize that the great majority of television graduates will remain in local station employment for many years. It is obviously unrealistic to allow training criteria to become established on the basis of network practices.

Most television directors will be concerned with meeting the expectations of management in a local commercial or educational television station. From the viewpoint of the employee, the evaluative judgments of station management personnel are highly significant. Judgments by management ordinarily determine the extent to which an employee succeeds in terms of salary, promotions, preferential assignments, and job recommendations. Even if an evaluation is ill-founded, superficial or prejudiced, the employee is affected nevertheless. Success, in a material sense, is more likely to be achieved by an employee if management thinks of him as an effective employee. It is important, therefore, for both the student and the educator to know what qualities, abilities and characteristics are necessary if the television director is to meet the requirements of station management.

There has been very little reporting of specific research into the requirements for success in television directing or the factors involved in the evaluative judgments of station management. In fact, criteria for success in other jobs in broadcasting are equally lacking. During the years while the writer has been concerned with investigations into this subject, no more than a half dozen related studies have been identified.

A review of the job of the television director and the experience to date in training directors reveal several facts to be outstanding.

1. Because talented, well-trained directors are vitally important to television broadcasting, stations are always seeking good directors.
2. Preparation for work in television directing is a substantially active area of college level study.
3. Directing will be a career job for many students of broadcasting.
4. Because of the variety and difficulty of tasks and procedures for which the director is responsible, directing is one of the most difficult television jobs for which to train students.
5. There is a lack of research-based information regarding requirements for success in television directing. There is even less information about qualifications needed for directing in educational television stations than there is about qualifications needed for directing in commercial stations. These facts led to the conclusion that there was a real need for the proposed study.

## C. Objectives of the Study.

The study was designed to answer three questions concerning directing and directors in educational television stations. These were as follows:

1. What behaviors of directors appear most often as factors in judgments of effectiveness which television station management personnel make concerning their directors?
2. What are the non-behavioral characteristics (such as age, education, and work experience) of the directors who are now employed in a sample group of ETV stations?
3. What job activities are the directors who are now employed in a sample group of ETV stations expected to perform?

D. Procedure and Sources of Data.

The selection of the main data-gathering instrument or procedure was determined chiefly by the fact that the principal aim of the research was to identify those behaviors of directors that appear as factors in judgments of effectiveness which are made by station management personnel. If direct questions had been used in an effort to identify the factors, the results might have been affected to a considerable degree by differences in the analytical abilities of respondents, semantic differences, personal biases, and memory. Data obtained in the form of critical incidents would tend to be less affected by these variables. The critical incident technique developed by Dr. John Flanagan appeared to be an effective means of gathering the main body of data needed.

The procedures recommended by Flanagan are explained in Chapter III. The application of the critical incident technique in this study followed Flanagan's recommendations as closely as possible.

The second instrument employed was a form which was devised for use by the investigator in recording personal data about a director during an interview. Information about such matters as age, college training, directing experience, total experience in television and radio, and non-broadcasting job experience was requested.

The third instrument used was a job analysis checklist. The basic form was developed by the investigator for use in an earlier study of the job activities of directors in commercial television stations. The original form was modified to accommodate descriptions of the director's duties in ETV stations. Specific work activities of directors in each station in the sample group were identified and recorded on the checklist during interviews with management.

Data was collected from a sample of thirteen ETV stations in seven midwestern states, ranging from north to south. These stations were chosen to be reasonably representative of the different types of ETV stations licensed in this country.

Critical incident data was collected from station management personnel, chiefly managers but including some other station officials who were in positions of management authority over directors.

Personal data concerning ETV directors was collected from the directors themselves during interviews at the station. Data was obtained on every director employed in the sample of stations.

Job analysis information was ordinarily obtained from station managers during interviews. In two instances other officials on the management level supplied this data.

Categories for the classification of incidents were derived inductively from an examination of the critical incident data. Categories were revised until every incident was assigned under a heading that was descriptive of the critical behavior that was the heart of that incident. Two classifiers, both experienced in television production management, worked separately in assigning incidents to categories. A list of critical requirements was constructed on the basis of the classified incidents.

The personal data concerning directors employed in the sample stations and the job analysis information are reported in tabular form.

## E. Limitations of the Study.

The data used in this study came from stations in Wisconsin, Illinois, Iowa, Nebraska, Missouri, Oklahoma, and Texas. Therefore, the list of critical requirements, the personal data on directors, and the job analysis information may be peculiar to those states. However, judging from personal observation and from discussions with ETV station officials from other states, this researcher would predict that there would be only minor variations to be found in similar data from ETV stations in different sections of the country.

It must be remembered that the data for this study came entirely from educational television stations. The nature of the directing function, the characteristics of directors, and the critical requirements for success in directing in commercial television stations may differ from the results of this study in many important respects. Any application of the results of this study to directing in a commercial station situation must be done only with the most thoughtful caution.

The nature of the critical incident technique limits the incidents collected to those which deal only with critical behaviors as distinguished from non-critical behaviors. This means that the list of critical requirements will not reflect any activities which were performed without evoking any pronounced evaluative judgments from management. Therefore, the list cannot serve alone as a checklist of all skills, abilities, and characteristics needed by ETV station directors. Such an application would surely result in the oversight of any behaviors which were performed without significant variation or without attracting specific attention. The job analysis checklist, on the other hand, made no distinction between critical and non-critical behaviors and was designed to identify all tasks performed by ETV directors.

## F. Definition of Terms.

Educational television station: A television broadcasting station that is licensed for non-commercial operation and is assigned either to a UHF or a VHF channel reserved for education.

Director: An employee of a television station who is personally responsible for conducting the production preparation and final presentation of television programs. An ETV director is one who is employed to work full-time or part-time as a director in an educational television station.

Producer-director: An employee of a television station who is responsible for planning and organizing or coordinating the planning and organization of television programs and in addition is personally responsible for conducting the production preparation and final presentation of television programs. An ETV producer-director is one who is employed to work full-time or part-time as a producer-director in an educational television station.

Management, management personnel: Those executives in a television station who have authority over directors and who have responsibility for making and acting upon evaluative judgments or for making and reporting evaluative judgments concerning the effectiveness of the station's directors. As used in this study the term may include the station manager, assistant manager, operations manager, program manager, program director, and production manager.

# CHAPTER II

## REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

College training in radio-television is aimed primarily at preparing students for employment in broadcasting stations. In seeking to accomplish that objective it is common for educators to turn to station management personnel for guidance and advice. Obviously, to be successful, training for broadcasting must be based on the needs of the industry. Broadcasters themselves are logical spokesmen to identify those needs. No suggestions concerning what should make up the broadcasting curriculum carry more weight than "what managers say they want and need." Although most such advice from the broadcasting industry has been informal and rather casually reported, researchers have not altogether neglected this resource. Studies by Helton, Roulston, and Adkins have reported and analyzed statements by station management as to what characteristics and training are desired in employees. Lawton and Adkins reported management responses to the question of why television employees failed on the job.

It has been recognized that the industry can provide yet another useful guide to training, and one that tends to minimize any bias that may come from the subjective judgments of employers. This source of assistance is the inventory of job activities. Roulston, Bedwell, Seltz, and Adkins have all conducted research that was designed to identify job activities performed by certain employees.

When referring to qualifications for employment in television and the nature of job activities, textbook authors have usually drawn from their own experience and observations or have related the advice of professional broadcasters. Textbook references to research in the areas of job qualifications, activities, and requirements are extremely scarce.

The body of this chapter is devoted to a review of studies relating to personnel in television directing and to a review of a selection of textbook statements regarding the nature of the television director's job, responsibilities, and qualifications. This examination of research and literature is intended to indicate the nature and extent of research efforts in the area and the nature of the existing textbook material relating to requirements for the television director.

## A. Research Studies.

A study conducted by Helton in 1949 and 1950 was designed to answer certain questions relating to the nature of college instruction in non-technical television and to the apparent instructional needs in training for television.[1] Helton states:

> It is the purpose of this study to determine the status of instruction in non-technical television techniques and procedures in the senior colleges of Texas as well as a corresponding investigation into the offerings of out-of-state colleges and universities. Furthermore, this study is concerned with the future plans of these Texas universities and colleges relative to non-technical television instruction, as well as with determining some of the employee-qualifications sought by commercial telecasters now operating in Texas. A third phase of this study deals with a suggested curriculum in non-technical television procedures and techniques.[2]

The matter of employee qualifications was represented in the problem analysis by the question: "What do commercial telecasters now operating in Texas seek as qualifications for those whom they employ to carry on their telecasting operations?"[1]

---

[1] William B. Helton, A Study of Instruction in Television in Texas Senior Colleges and of Employee Qualifications Sought by Texas Telecasters. (Unpublished master's thesis, North Texas State College), 1950.

[2] Ibid., p. 3.

In an attempt to learn what commercial telecasters want in the way of qualifications for non-technical personnel, interviews were held with the program directors of the six commercial television stations operating in Texas at that time. The form sheet used in interviewing the program directors included six statements and questions to which the interviewee was to respond. Four of these items had some relationship to employee qualifications.

The first statement began: "For program personnel in my TV set-up, I look for the employee who . . . ." The five completion choices which were to be ranked in order of importance indicated that Helton was referring to performing personnel. Helton showed the results of ranking as follows:

1. Is a good ad lib man
2. Has a good AM voice
3. Is at ease before an audience (ranked equally with No. 4)
4. Is telegenic
5. Has acting ability.[2]

The second statement began: "For those employees who don't necessarily work before the cameras, I want people who . . . ." Nine completion choices were offered on the interview sheet, but the responses were grouped under four topics in reporting the results. Ranking results were as follows:

1. Care and maintenance of film, use of projector
2. Scenic execution
3. Use of 16 mm. camera
4. Costume designing and execution.[3]

---

[1] *Ibid*., p. 4.

[2] *Ibid*., p. 39.

[3] *Ibid*., p. 43.

The third statement began: "Writers for television should be trained along the lines of . . . ." The completion choices were ranked by respondents in the following order of importance:

1. Movie-scenario
2. Stage
3. AM radio
4. Printed media.[1]

The fourth statement began: "I feel that the best professional background for a television director is . . . ." The four completion choices which were offered were ranked as follows:

1. Legitimate theater
2. AM radio (ranked equally with No. 3)
3. Non-professional theater
4. Vaudeville and night club.[2]

Information relating to training for television in Texas was gathered by questionnaire from seven senior colleges. Information concerning television training being offered outside of Texas came from catalogues and the existing literature. None of the responses or tabulations relating to curriculum or training programs referred to specific characteristics or qualifications of employees. Discussion was in terms of subject matter or course areas.

In summary, the only data Helton's study produced which had a bearing on the qualifications needed by television directors was from the importance ranking of four areas of professional experience. No mention was made of specific skills, areas of information, or personal attributes needed by television directors.

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 44.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 45.

Roulston conducted one of the early studies of management opinions concerning qualifications of production personnel in television stations.[1] Qualifications were defined as ". . . abilities, background of education and experience, personal vital statistics, and personality characteristics that are considered by station managers in employing and retaining personnel on their TV station staff."[2] The stated purposes of the study were as follows:

> (1) . . . To make available to teachers and students of television the attitudes of those professionally engaged in the television industry in order that courses in TV may at least attempt to provide the type of education and training deemed valuable. . . .
> (2) . . . To attempt a definitive description of the term "production personnel" based on common elements in all descriptions of the term.
> (3) . . . To discover the most important qualifications of the director.[3]

Data was collected through questionnaires mailed to the managers of 256 commercial television stations. The letter of transmittal and the instructions on the questionnaire referred to "production personnel qualifications" but the position of director was not mentioned specifically. Questionnaire items were constructed by Roulston on the basis of her own personal experience, information from textbooks, a study of job application forms, and the comments of several broadcasters who were interviewed. Responses were received from 70 stations. However, the section relating to personal characteristics was included on only 50 questionnaires and only 20 of these were among those returned.

---

[1] Rosalind Jane Roulston, A Survey of the Qualifications of Production Personnel in Television Stations in the United States. (Unpublished master's thesis, Emerson College), 1953.

[2] Ibid., pp. 38-39.

[3] Ibid., pp. 37-38.

The parts of Roulston's questionnaire which were most relevant to this research project included those in which managers were requested to rank first according to importance and then according to frequency of use 35 specific tasks and functions for which production personnel are commonly responsible. Rankings according to the two criteria proved to be very similar. Importance and frequency rankings were identical in the cases of the four leading items. Maintaining harmonious relations with sponsors, talent and staff topped both lists, followed by calling shots on semi-scripted shows, directing commercials, and calling shots on fully scripted shows. Among the top 18 items in each list, only four were not common to both lists.

Twenty managers cooperated by ranking according to importance the twenty personal characteristics listed. Rankings placed punctuality first in the greatest number of cases, followed by reliability, conscientiousness, loyalty, stability under pressure, cooperativeness, attentiveness to detail, and so on.

According to Roulston's statement of purposes, the "most important qualifications of the director" were to be ascertained through this research. However, no question referred to personal characteristics, qualifications, or duties of directors specifically. Any such list of qualifications must be developed by the reader through inference from the tabular information concerning the respondents' ranking of duties and characteristics of production personnel in general.

Adkins conducted a study which involved the collection and classification of statements by television station managers concerning the qualifications needed by new employees in television.[1] The principal objective of the study was to determine what specific personal characteristics and what specific aspects of training were regarded by station managers as most important for success in television station employment. It was hoped that the data would justify a conclusion as to the comparative importance that managers assigned to (1) the area of personal characteristics and to (2) the area of training (skills, professional abilities, and information) in the achievement of job success in television. The study was also intended to obtain in the exact words of station managers brief and pointed statements concerning the qualities that they think make for the success or failure of new employees in commercial television stations.

Data for the study was collected through the use of a mailed questionnaire with questions of the open-end variety to be answered in whatever words and at whatever length the respondent chose. Data was received from 189 (63.0 per cent) of the 300 television station managers to whom the questionnaire was sent. The returns from 42 states and the District of Columbia represented 42.7 per cent of the 442 commercial television stations in operation in this country during the first week of January, 1956.[2]

An _a posteriori_ type of content analysis was employed to isolate and classify the basic ideas or themes in the responses. The essential steps in the analysis were as follows: (1) Inspection of data and construction of a tentative system of answer themes. In this process, suitable theme classifications were derived by induction from the statements examined. (2) Detailed and explicit definition of answer themes. (3) Trial analyses in which competent people attempted to classify the content of a random selection of statements under the thematic headings provided. (4) Modifications to improve the answer themes and definitions. (5) Classification of all content of all responses to each question. (6) Quantification in terms of incidence or frequency of mention.

---

[1] Gale R. Adkins, _What is Important for the Success of a New Employee in Television? Part I. A Study of Statements by Station Managers._ (Lawrence; University of Kansas), 1959. 52 pp.

[2] _Broadcasting Magazine_ Vol. 50, No. 2, (January 9, 1956), p. 114.

Of the questions posed, the one most closely related to the subject of critical requirements for television directors was worded, "What quality of personality or training do you value most in any new employee?" In half of the questionnaires the phrase "training or personality" was used as an alternative wording in this question. Classification of responses to the question revealed that 87.6 per cent of the items mentioned were in the area of personal qualities and only 12.3 per cent had to do with aspects of training (professional skills, abilities and information).

The personal quality mentioned most often in response to the question stated above was the ability to get along with others. References to this particular ability occurred in 37.7 per cent of the 180 responses to the question. Other personal qualities mentioned, in order of frequency, were: desire to learn (mentioned in 30.0 per cent of the responses); willingness to work hard (23.3 per cent); sincere interest in the job (20.5 per cent); willingness to take orders (17.7 per cent); tendency to follow an assignment to completion (16.1 per cent); and ability to think effectively (13.3 per cent). The complete list contained thirty answer themes.

The aspect of training most often mentioned in responses to the cited question was a good basic knowledge of television (mentioned in 6.1 per cent of 180 responses). The remaining 19 answer themes included: versatility (5.6 per cent); broad academic background (4.4 per cent); and practical training for work in small stations (3.9 per cent).

It was felt that the verbatim statements of the responding managers communicated much in the way of feelings, attitudes, and emphasis that is unavoidably lost in classification and tabulation. To avoid losing those bonus values an extensive collection of responses to all questions was made available in a separate volume, designated as Part II of the report.[1]

The report pointed out that there is likely to be a high degree of agreement between the qualities that managers value most in new employees and the qualities that are most conducive to a new employee's success and advancement in a station. Many of the qualities identified in the responses to this question may eventually prove to be critical requirements applying to the broad area of employment in television.

A research report by Lawton cites reasons given by television station management for discharging employees.[2] Information obtained from questionnaires returned by mail from 258 (47.6 per cent) of the commercial television stations in the United States indicated that 249 employees had been discharged by these stations during 1960. Many of the responding stations did not state their reasons for discharging personnel. In fact, reasons were supplied for only 186 (74.6 per cent) of the 249 dismissals.

---

[1] Gale R. Adkins, What Is Important for the Success of a New Employee in Television? Part II. A Collection of Statements by Station Managers (Lawrence: The University of Kansas, 1959), p. 47.

[2] Sherman P. Lawton, Employment Facts and Factors at Radio and Television Stations (Norman: University of Oklahoma, 1961), p. 14 (mimeographed).

To facilitate data analysis the reasons for discharging employees were grouped into five categories: ability; application; personal factors; relationships with other people; and management factors. As classified by Lawton the greatest percentage (41.6 per cent) of the reasons related to the ability of the discharged person. Among stations in different size groups, items relating to ability constituted 25.0 per cent of the reasons given by small stations (1 to 40 employees); 38.3 per cent of the reasons given by medium sized stations (41 to 70 employees); and 50.0 per cent of the reasons given by large stations (above 70 employees). Reasons were stated in terms and phrases such as: incompetence; lack of ability; couldn't handle job; replaced by more competent people; and unsatisfactory work.

Of the employees discharged by the reporting stations, 28.7 per cent were said to have been dismissed for reasons relating to the application o of abilities. Wordings supplied by the respondents to describe lack of application included: laziness; insufficient allegiance and devotion to station; didn't improve; inefficient; inattention to duty; neglect of duty; lack of effort; and failure to perform.

Only 6.1 per cent of those discharged were let go for "personal reasons." The specific mentions included alcoholism; bad credit; dishonesty; too many parties; personal life; and opium smoking.

Only 2.0 per cent of the dismissals were said to have been caused by unsatisfactory personal relationships with other people. The stated reasons included quarrelsomeness; trouble making; inability to work with others; and insubordination.

Management factors accounted for 21.5 per cent of the reported discharges from television stations. Those factors included job consolidation; changes in operating procedure; department reallignment; reorganization; overstaffed; job elimination; more compact operation; in new quarters; failure to conform to new format; and conflict in program philosophy.

In any attempt to relate Lawton's study to the problem of critical requirements for television directors, certain limitations should be recognized. First, the employee dismissals reported by stations were totals for all departments including the clerical area. No data was provided concerning the number of dismissals or reasons for dismissal from specific jobs or station departments. The interpretation and classification of reasons involved considerable margin for error due to the semantic problem in determining the intended meaning of the extremely brief statements of cause. Lawton pointed out that there was no way of knowing exactly what a respondent meant by a word or phrase, many of which were general terms. The extent to which an employer might tend to explain dismissals in terms of conventional or uncomplicated reasons could be a subject for further research.

In 1955 Bedwell conducted the first study in which an attempt was made to focus on the tasks of defining the duties of television directors and determining the qualifications of directors.[1] The study was designed to answer the following questions:

> (1) What are the individual duties of directors in the operation of a television station? (2) What are the educational, professional, and non-professional qualifications of persons

---

[1] Raymond T. Bedwell, A Study of the Duties and Qualifications of Television Station Directors. (Unpublished master's thesis, Ohio University, 1955), p. 103.

> now employed as television directors? (3) What educational qualifications are required by the management of television stations hiring new directors? (4) What background qualifications are thought desirable by the management of television stations hiring new directors?

Data for the study was collected from 16 commercial TV stations in Ohio and West Virginia. Bedwell interviewed directors and management personnel and supplemented these contacts with questionnaires completed by individuals who could not be interviewed. Data was obtained from 12 persons in management and from 41 directors in the 16 stations.

Twelve stations supplied data in response to the question which asked management personnel to indicate the extent to which directors perform certain duties which were specified in a checklist. A relatively small selection of items was provided. The results reported by Bedwell are shown in Table 1.

The educational, professional, and non-professional qualifications of directors employed at the stations were investigated with several questions. It was reported that all directors had completed high school and 35 of them had taken some college work. Seventeen had bachelor's degrees and three had master's degrees. Ten directors had taken specialized work at technical or trade school. The directors were asked to indicate which courses they had taken in college by making checkmarks on a list of 24 courses. About half of the courses on the prepared list were in radio-television areas. The courses most frequently checked by the directors were English, music, oral interpretation, dramatic literature, TV production, acting, world history, radio writing, radio directing, TV directing, stagecraft, scene design, lighting, programming, station management, and TV writing. There was no indication as to whether this work was done in college or in trade school.

## TABLE 1

## DATA SUPPLIED BY MANAGEMENT CONCERNING DUTIES OF DIRECTORS[1]

| | (To what extent do directors have these duties)[2] | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Regular | Sometimes | Never |
| Duties | | | |
| Writing | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| Script selecting | | 3 | 9 |
| Editing | 2 | 10 | |
| Casting | 2 | 6 | 4 |
| Set designing | 4 | 6 | 2 |
| Lighting | 6 | 5 | 1 |
| Staging | 12 | | |
| Costuming | 3 | 9 | |
| Make-up | 2 | 6 | 2 |
| Control room supervising | 12 | | |
| Additional Duties (write-in items) | | | |
| Supervising rehearsals | 4 | | |
| Operating video equipment | 2 | | |
| Producing station breaks | | 1 | |
| Meeting representatives who aid in producing their own shows | 1 | | |
| Operating turntables | 1 | | |

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 26 and 30.

[2] (Twelve stations replied to this question.)

In the area of professional experience, 16 directors had previously worked in radio. Seventeen directors had previous television experience before coming to the stations where they were now employed. Ten came to their stations as directors, and the others worked up from other positions. Thirteen directors reported having had professional theatre experience. Seven directors had had experience in the field of art. Five reported professional experience in photography.

Educational qualifications required of new directors were indicated in general terms. Six stations required that directors have a high school education and three required some college work.

Responses to the questions dealing with "background qualifications" have relevancy to this study of critical requirements. The question, "What do you consider the best experience for the director's job?" was asked of the 12 persons in management. Five of these individuals recommended experience in theatre. Four suggested experience in a television station. Radio experience was recommended by two people. Other recommendations included travel, work in psychology, a general art background, and any position which requires working closely with a number of people. Of the directors who responded to the question, eight recommended work in a television station. Eight directors suggested experience in the theatre as being most valuable. Three directors indicated work in radio as being most important. All other suggestions by directors were single mentions.

The question, "What do you feel are the most desirable personal qualities in a director?" was answered by the 12 management people. Six persons indicated that the ability to get along with people was most valuable. Two specified imagination, quick thinking, a sense of cooperation, and a knowledge of people. Others mentioned a knowledge of how to give orders, a sense of authority, the ability to create teamwork, talent, the ability to create enthusiasm among his co-workers, the ability to think on his own, personality, ambition, sincerity, cooperation, loyalty, responsibility, coordination, and leadership. Some other recommendations included a willingness to experiment, being a "mechanic," a flair for dramatics, calmness, neatness, a good picture "instinct," and the qualities of a good supervisor.

The 41 directors were also asked the question, "What, in your opinion, are the most desirable personal qualities in a director?" Nine directors felt that the ability to get along with people was most valuable. Imagination was considered most valuable by eight directors. Six men felt that alertness was the most desirable personal quality in a director. Calmness was considered most valuable by six directors, and four felt that patience was most important. Some other personal qualities suggested as being most valuable were the ability to work with people; a knowledge of people; the ability to organize and supervise; ingenuity; alertness; an appreciation of the arts; common sense; humility; ability to work under pressure; an even temper; a sense of composition and timing; clear, concise thinking; gregariousness; self-assurance; a sense of humor; creativity; confidence; improvisation; a "high degree of comprehensive ability"; efficiency; "iron nerves"; "level-headedness"; a knowledge of the field; agreeability; ability to give orders; and the qualities of a good executive. Some other recommended personal qualities were personality; ability to command respect; "immunity to stomach ulcers," self criticism; a cooperative attitude; understanding, forcefulness; conscientious leadership; good speech;

depth of feeling; knowledge of psychology; thoroughness; tact; a broad outlook; and the ability to discover the level of the audience to which the efforts of the production are directed.

In Bedwell's study most questions relating to qualifications were designed to evoke opinions as to training and work experience needed. There was no attempt to determine objectively the extent to which specific skills or areas of information were actually used on the job. The question concerning desirable personal qualities produced a long list of items. Presumably these were terms that occurred spontaneously to the respondent and ones which he chose to constitute his response. There was no procedure for determining the extent to which these qualities actually functioned as factors in shaping the evaluative judgments of management.

Seltz conducted a research study designed to obtain certain facts about directors employed at local television stations.[1] The questions to be answered were "How many [directors] are there, where do they come from, what are their working conditions and salaries? What can the university-trained TV director expect to encounter as he approaches his first assignment in the industry?"[2]

Stations were surveyed in Ohio, West Virginia, Indiana, Michigan, Kentucky, Illinois, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Missouri, and Iowa. A questionnaire was mailed to program directors in 117 stations and 101 replies were received. The data disclosed that there were 337 full-time directors employed at the 101 stations. Fifty-nine stations reported the employment of part-time directors in addition to the full-time staff. Twelve stations reported having women directors. Seltz concluded that those program directors who were opposed to hiring women directors were more concerned with personnel relationships between the directors and the usually all-male crew, than with the ability of the women to direct.

---

[1] Herbert Seltz, "The Local Television Director." Journal of Broadcasting. Vol. III, No. 2 (Spring, 1959), pp. 140-146.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 142.

Only a few questions served to collect information as to the specific tasks performed by directors. Seventeen stations reported that they maintained separate staffs of producers and directors. In the remaining stations the producer-director functions were handled as a combination assignment. Directors were on duty during the time that the station was taking network service in only 37 stations. Directors did their own video switching at 43 of the stations.

None of the questions related specifically to personal characteristics needed by directors, nor was there any attempt to evaluate the relative importance of particular skills or areas of training or experience.

Adkins conducted a job analysis which was designed to aid in the training of television directors by identifying the specific tasks or jobs a director is expected to perform in a commercial station. Although the basic function of all television directors tends to be the same, it was assumed that the specific tasks performed by different directors might vary within a single station as well as from station to station. Therefore, an instrument was needed which would indicate how commonly each task was expected of directors in a particular station.

The instrument developed was a three page checklist identifying 78 different work activities such as, "operate switcher," "operate video shading controls," "think up ideas for commercials," "describe set lighting needed," and so on. Non-directorial items, such as "announce off-camera commercials," were included in an effort to identify duties less commonly assigned to a director. Write-in items were also invited. The job activities listed on the checklist were selected because of the suggestions of broadcasters and because of the investigator's observations and previous research in commercial station operations. The station manager was to place a checkmark opposite each of the 78 items and in one of four columns. The columns were headed:

NOT DONE by any of our directors
NOT A NORMAL responsibility for ANY director but is sometimes done by a director
A NORMAL responsibility for some directors but not for all
A NORMAL responsibility for ALL directors at this station

The 94 commercial television stations operating in Florida, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas during the spring of 1957 were asked to supply data. In 30 stations the job analysis checklist was administered during personal interviews. Checklists were mailed, along with a letter of explanation, to the managers of the remaining 64 commercial television stations in the six states. After a second mailing to non-respondents, the total of usable returned checklists reached 74 or 78.7 per cent of the 94 stations in the area.

Tables reporting the results showed the number and percentage of checkmarks in each column for each of the 78 work activities. Responding stations were classified into four groups using the station rate structure as the index of a cluster of size-coverage-prestige factors. Tables were prepared to show for each size group the number and per cent of the checkmarks in each column for each of the 78 activities.

The job analysis produced in functional terms a reasonably comprehensive description of what the television director in a commercial station is expected to do while at work. It supplied a measure of how commonly directors are expected to perform certain tasks. No questions were asked regarding personal characteristics desired in directors, and there was no specific attempt at evaluating the importance of specific skills and abilities in the achievement of job success.

The findings of the study do hold many implications regarding the qualities needed by directors. For example, the five duties most often reported as normal responsibilities for all directors at a station were: (1) check for errors in the script or continuity he is to direct, (2) check for errors in the commercial copy he is to direct, (3) direct and call shots on commercials, (4) direct and call shots on live productions, and (5) conduct rehearsals. It seems logical to conclude that if an employee is to serve satisfactorily as a director he must be prepared to perform these and the other tasks usually expected of directors. Whatever personal attributes might be important for the effective execution of those tasks would in themselves become important qualifications. Undoubtedly some sound conclusions about desirable personal qualities could be derived through such reasoning.

Although the job analysis produced information that can be very useful in training television directors, the technique does not seem adequate for determining a complete list of critical requirements.

Research investigations that have produced information regarding the work of the television director or the qualifications needed by the director are relatively few in number. It is relevant to comment, however, that even less research has been developed concerning the job requirements and qualifications needed for other lines of work in the radio-television industry.

Although the amount of research is limited, there are very few instances in which the existing studies have been quoted in the textbooks. Authors have drawn from their own insights and experience or have cited the statements of other broadcasters. An examination of what some of the best known textbooks have to say about the job of the television director will provide the other significant dimension of the literature.

## B. Textbook Material.

Most textbooks that deal with the subject of television directing have been designed to cover the broader area of television production. An examination of textbooks in the field will show that the word "production" appears in the book titles much more commonly than the word "directing" does. A book devoted to the area of television production might include chapters dealing with the television camera, audio, lighting, scenery, graphics, special effects, television recording, performance techniques, make-up, and station personnel as well as a chapter on directing. Such a division of content is in recognition of the fact that a television program involves many independent though closely related parts and services. However, all the components become the concern of the television director before or during the final on-the-air presentation.

Books on television production are not the only textbooks that discuss the role of the television director. Any comprehensive book on television program planning, station operation, writing, advertising or an introduction to the field of broadcasting is likely to include some discussion of directing. This is because the activities of the director bring him into close contact with nearly every area of station operation.

Probably most experienced broadcasters would agree that it is the man rather than the machine that makes the real difference in television directing. Nevertheless, much more textbook space has been devoted to explaining the tools of the trade (e.g. cameras, audio, lighting, and graphics) than to discussing the process or artistry of directing or the qualifications of the director.

### Responsibility and the Director.

One of the points most often stressed in the textbook descriptions of the directing function is the extent and weight of responsibility carried by the television director. The fact that the director is the central figure in the business of putting a production on the air is made quite clear by writers on the subject.

Kaufman emphasizes the director's role in guiding and shaping the production.

> Like an orchestra without a conductor or a ship without a captain, the television show without a firm, knowing director would be lost in a tangle of discordant elements. For the director is the catalyst that ties all the diverse television ends together. It is the director who gives to each show an individuality based upon his knowledge, taste, technique, personality as well as the many other intangibles which set him as a human being apart from any other.[1]

Bolen says

---

[1] William I. Kaufman, How to Direct for Television (New York: Hastings House, 1955), p. 9.

> Mr. Full-charge, in the preparation and presentation of a live television show, is the director. . . . In him is vested the full responsibility for the proper presentation of the telecast entertainment in every detail.[1]

Abbot and Rider speak of the television director as the necessary means through which other specialists channel their contributions to the broadcast.

> The director is, first of all, the coordinator of the many people involved in the production of a program. The many arts and skills that go into the program must be funneled into a concentrated effort. The director serves as the funnel. He is like the quarterback on a football team. He calls the signals and coordinated the effort, but he is not the whole team.[2]

White suggests the pressure that accompanies the director's "full responsibility."

> His [the director's] "big moment" is the actual telecast, as there he reigns supreme. The entire performance is his responsibility: he and his assistants control everything, cueing in music and sound, instructing cameramen to set up their next shots, calling out instructions as to which shot to take, instructing the floor manager on cues to actors, watching the time -- in short, controlling the entire show.[3]

Chester, Garrison, and Willis comment on the mass of details with which the director must deal promptly and wisely.

> The director is obliged to supervise many details in putting together a broadcast or a telecast. The necessity to decide which details require attention first and which are of lesser importance led one network to give the following dictum to newly hired directors: "There are fifty specific things you need to do before a broadcast, but the rehearsal time allotted makes it possible to do only twenty-five out of the fifty. The

---

[1] Murray Bolen, Fundamentals of Television (Hollywood, Calif.: Hollywood Radio Publishers, Inc., 1950), p. 132.

[2] Waldo Abbot and Richard L. Rider, Handbook of Broadcasting (4th ed.; New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1957), p. 359.

[3] Melvin R. White, Beginning Television Production (Minneapolis: Burgess Publishing Company, 1953), p. 92.

> choice of which twenty-five you do makes the difference between a good showmanlike production and a poor one which may have polish in unimportant details but misses fire."[1]

Greene refers to the pressure of directing and underlines the fact that during production everything seems to depend upon the director.

> The director . . . [is] . . . the most over-burdened man in television. He has the problem of a continuous performance timed to the split second, but without even a twentieth of the time a legitimate play takes for rehearsal. In addition to this he is also called upon to make what is, in many ways a movie, but with three cameras buzzing almost simultaneously, and denied the luxury of taking time out to set up another scene. He is, in fact, the master of a three-ringed circus with aerial acts, with every single performer and technician dependent upon his cue and work. It is not an easy position; to the layman, it may seem almost impossible.[2]

Creative responsibilities of the director tend to vary from station to station, depending on the types of production done at the station and the personnel set-up. Creative opportunities may also vary with individual directing assignments within a single station. Becker and Harshbarger refer to these differences.

> He [the director] will vary from someone who simply sits in the control room and calls pre-set shots on whatever program or commercial happens to be on the air to someone who has a truly creative position. In the latter case, the director might even be the person who had the original idea for the program, developed it, rehearsed the performers, and planned the staging as well as the shots which he calls during the air show. . . . Almost always, whatever happens on the program is ultimately his responsibility.[3]

---

[1] Giraud Chester, Garnet R. Garrison, and Edgar E. Willis, Television and Radio (3d ed., New York: Appleton-Century-Crosts, 1963), p. 565.

[2] Robert S. Greene, Television Writing (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1952), p. 2.

[3] Samuel L. Becker and H. Clay Harshbarger, Television: Techniques for Planning and Performance (New York: Henry Holt and Company, Inc., 1958), p. 6.

Needs in Areas of Technical Competency.

Although the television director may not actually operate any equipment himself, he must supervise the operation of equipment with meticulous care. It is his job to obtain the combinations of picture and sound that best convey the program content. The degree to which these results are obtained depends to a large extent on the skill and discrimination with which equipment is manipulated under his supervision. Writers agree that the director should at least be familiar with the capabilities of the equipment with which he works. Lawton says

> A station director must of course be familiar with his equipment and its capacities. . . . TV equipment is an immediate concern of the director.[1]

Stasheff and Brentz emphasize the number of technical matters with which the director should be familiar.

> The director must know his medium. Only a television director who is thoroughly familiar with the tools of his trade can be successful in this mechanically complicated medium. He must know cameras and lenses, lighting equipment, special effects techniques, audio filters, echo chambers, and a hundred other things which implement the production arts of television.[2]

Zettl refers to the director's unique responsibility for employing equipment to achieve an artistically pleasing result.

> Your job is considerably complicated because you have to make a highly technical medium work artistically for you. This means that you have to know the potentials and limitations of all television production elements before you can use them properly.[3]

---

[1] Sherman P. Lawton, The Modern Broadcaster (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1961), p. 161.

[2] Edward Stasheff and Rudy Bretz, The Television Program (2d ed.: New York: Hill and Wang, 1956), pp. 219-220.

[3] Herbert Zettl, Television Production Handbook (San Francisco: Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc., 1961), p. 339.

Hubbell calls attention to the fact that the director must be successful in guiding others in the artistic use of television equipment.

> Cameras and microphones are tools which the director uses to express the meaning of the program, and a close artistic sympathy and teamwork must exist between all members of the production unit -- director, cameramen, audio men, lighting men -- if good results are to be obtained.[1]

Kaufman feels that a knowledge of technical problems will help the director work more effectively with his production team.

> Once the director realizes all the technical problems and the time required to do them well his patience will be fortified with understanding. He will have the ability to pace himself better during camera blocking, air time, in any emergency in fact, and all this will add to his self control.[2]

Kingson, Cowgill, and Levy reflect practices in the motion picture industry when they suggest that a director may concern himself primarily with results and depend on skilled specialists to achieve those results.

> A television director should have a comprehensive, though usually nontechnical, understanding of the facilities he uses, the potential of each tool, and so far as that goes, of each man. Some directors know very little about, for example, camera techniques, but they know how to hire men who do. Most important, they know the effect they want to achieve and what tools will do it.[3]

Hubbell points out that television borrows techniques from other media. Therefore, the need for an understanding of the technical procedures common to the related media may also be desirable.

> His [the director's] function bears striking resemblance to the combined duties of a motion-picture director and cutter, an

---

[1] Richard Hubbell, Television Programming and Production (3d ed.; New York: Rinehart & Company, Inc., 1956), p. 113.

[2] William I. Kaufman, loc. cit., p. 79.

[3] Walter K. Kingson, Rome Cowgill, and Ralph Levy, Broadcasting Television and Radio (New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1955), p. 106.

> orchestral conductor, and a radio director. He must have learned everything there is to know about television production, which includes most of the major problems of motion pictures and stage, plus the technical complexities of radio network operation and timing.[1]

There seems to be no disagreement with the idea that the television director needs to possess many skills, competencies and strong personal qualities in order to handle the problems and procedures which are typically part of his job. He must know television equipment, and he should possess the kind of artistic talent that lends to great effectiveness in the communication of feelings and ideas. Bolen speaks of what the director needs to be.

> It goes without saying that he [the director] is the man of all work. He must be, in this order, a diplomatic genius, an actor of sorts, a writer, film-cutter, a top-sergeant, a partial engineer, and a man of artistic temperament.[2]

The question remains as to what kind of background or training is needed to prepare a person for a career as a television director.

## The Nature of Recommended Training and Experience.

Most writers seem to agree that a broad background of education and experience is desirable for a television director. The director must be much more than a trained technician. As important as equipment may be in television production, it is only the physical means with which communications decisions are executed. Demands upon the director's resources of insight, information, and intellect arise both from the program content and from the process of communicating to the audience through the instruments of television. Zettl refers to the idea that a director should understand and be able to draw upon the various communication arts.

---

[1] Richard Hubbell, loc. cit., p. 114.

[2] Murray Bolen, loc. cit.

> As a television director you need a good and varied education. It is not enough for you to know how to get a particular shot; you must also know why you want to get it. This means that you need some background in the creative arts, music, drama, painting, and dancing. You must also be familiar with the basic forms of literary expression.[1]

Lawton speaks of the variety of experience that is in the background of most of the best-known directors.

> Good network directors must obviously be well grounded in theater and literature; some have intimate familiarity with music, dance, and art; some are experienced in motion-picture work. Knowledge of these fields is also valuable to station directors, but their opportunities to use such knowledge are limited by the type of work done at stations.[2]

Abbot and Rider recognize the distinction between the physical and the conceptual aspects of the production process:

> It [directing] is a job that requires many talents and a broad background of learning and experience. . . . The director conceives, before the fact, what the final show will be like. It is only in the director's mind that a specific show exists before the program is actually done. It is his concept of the pictorial continuity, combining all of the raw materials of the program which is seen by the audience.[3]

Hubbell is intrigued with the importance of long experience in the making of a television director.

> A director is like a bottle of good wine. He must have natural talent to begin with; good wine begins with fine grapes. And just as a vintage wine needs years of seasoning before it is mature, so a television director requires years of experience before he matures.[4]

---

[1] Herbert Zettl, loc. cit.

[2] Sherman P. Lawton, loc. cit., p. 162.

[3] Waldo Abbot and Richard L. Rider, loc. cit.

[4] Richard Hubbell, loc. cit., p. 82.

Other authors express strong convictions concerning the value of particular types of training and experience. Kingson, Cowgill, and Levy say:

> A thorough indoctrination in the theater arts is probably the best education for television. Whether gained through formal courses, practical experience, or self-training, a knowledge of theater, radio, and motion pictures is helpful, because television has drawn something from each. . . . Anyone who knows how to direct a stage play, a radio program, and a motion picture could make the transfer to television.[1]

Kaufman is even more definite in advocating theatrical training.

> The prime requisite of TV directing has become the ability to deal with story material. Since the theatre provides the only adequate training ground for such skill, it is becoming apparent that the theatre is the most essential background for the director of dramatic television shows. It is only in the theatre that the aspiring director is given the time and the facilities to experiment in the handling of story material.[2]

Seehafer and Laemmar, in their popular text on broadcast advertising, emphasize the importance of a business orientation for those who plan and direct television presentations.

> A producer-director should have as broad a background in broadcasting as possible, plus the specific qualifications to handle the type of programs or commercials assigned to him. He should, of course, have a solid understanding of television or radio as an advertising medium. Moreover, he should have knowledge in such related fields as acting, writing, music, set design, and lighting. These skills make him flexible and better able to cope with the problems of a program campaign or a commercial production.[3]

Professional Skills and Abilities.

Many textbooks go beyond the general recommendations of technical competence and broad education and experience. Opinions concerning the professional skills and the personal characteristics that are needed by the television director are often strong and, on some points, frequently in agreement.

---

[1] Walter K. Kingson, Rome Cowgill, and Ralph Levy, loc. cit.

[2] William I. Kaufman, loc. cit., p. 72.

[3] Gene F. Seehafer and Jack W. Laemmar, Successful Television and Radio Advertising (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1959), pp. 215-216.

The need for showmanship is one of the ideas in which there seems to be general agreement. Unfortunately, showmanship is a quality that is very difficult to analyze or teach. White identifies some of the components through which the desired effect of showmanship is achieved.

> He [the director] should have SHOWMANSHIP, the word which summarizes the outstanding characteristic necessary to the director. . . . Showmanship is the art of attracting and keeping attention. What tools are available to the TV director to achieve showmanship? Words, sound effects, facial expression, pantomime, motion, color, composition, and lighting. With these he must bring a script to life.[1]

Seehafer and Laemmar suggest the elusive and subtle nature of the result of showmanship.

> The producer-director must have . . . showmanship. Showmanship gives a program or commercial a distinctive quality that captures and holds the interest and sympathy of the audience. It is a special touch of salesmanship woven into a presentation. Without this intangible quality to bring it to fruition, a good program or commercial idea can fall short in its execution. With showmanship, the producer-director injects the sparkle, timing, and enthusiasm necessary to ensure mass acceptance and a successful television or radio advertising presentation.[2]

Kingston, Cowgill, and Levy emphasize the importance of showmanship and, in addition, demonstrate the semantic circumvolution that usually occurs in discussions of showmanship.

> The most important single qualification for a television director is something which probably cannot be learned, at least not from a book. It is a sense of showmanship. At its simplest, showmanship is the art of exciting the attention and

---

[1] Melvin R. White, loc. cit., p. 86.

[2] Gene F. Seehafer and Jack W. Laemmar, loc. cit., p. 216.

> holding the interest of people. Or you can call it the art of entertaining people, which means about the same thing.[1]

Stasheff and Brentz pointed out the unique problem of time pressure in achieving showmanship in television.

> Directing a television program is a type of activity and showmanship which has never had a real counterpart in any other medium. If the film editor and the director of a motion picture were combined in one and asked to make most of the decisions of timing during the running of the film (cuing in dissolves, camera movements, and all the myriad elements of the production in he manner of a radio director), a general comparison could be made.[2]

If showmanship and effective communication are to be achieved in a television production they receive the breath of life at that magic moment when the director manipulates the camera eye. Each decision that affects the on-the-air picture is a moment of truth for the director. Millerson expresses the feeling that all authors of television production texts seem to share concerning the on-the-air presentation of program material.

> The selection of the right techniques at the right time marks off the creative artist from the hack. . . . Some directors rely largely upon the appeal of elaborate settings, dramatic lighting, and period costume to sell their work; instead of developing persuasive production techniques. But elaboration and expense are no substitute for skilled presentation.[3]

Stasheff and Bretz make a basic point concerning the importance of skillful camera control by the director.

Television is, first and foremost, a photographic medium, and

> Creative mastery of the camera's picture is essential to successful producing and directing.[4]

---

[1] Walter K. Kingson, Rome Cowgill, and Ralph Levy, loc. cit., pp. 101-102.

[2] Edward Stasheff and Rudy Bretz, The Television Program (3d ed.; New York: Hill and Wang, 1962), p. 161.

[3] Gerald Millerson, The Technique of Television Production (New York: Hastings House, 1961), p. 220.

[4] Edward Stasheff and Rudy Bretz, loc. cit., p. 121.

Books on television directing refer invariably to the importance of skill in pictorial composition as one of the vital elements in effective presentation.

Abbot and Rider say:

> He [the director] must have an appreciation for pictorial composition and artistic values. He must know what is important in the program and how to get the important things onto the television screen.[1]

White states:

> He should know pictorial composition — line, mass, space, color, and the use thereof. . . . He should know that drama means something happening, not something just talked about.[2]

Zettl refers to the need for quick and sure decisions in all such judgments.

> You [the director] must know when a picture, sound, or movement is good or bad, and you must know why it is good or bad. You must be decisive. You cannot afford to try one specific setup three or four different ways before you finally decide which is best.[3]

Some points of advice concerning professional skills are seldom mentioned in textbooks, and the reader has no indication as to whether experts agree on these points or not. Should a director be a competent writer? Consider this statement from a text by Stasheff and Bretz.

> Bert Gold, a television consultant who has trained the staff and established the program structure for many a small station, goes so far as to say, "No director is worth his salt at a small station who can't write simple continuity for his own shows, edit news copy from the ticker, and write commercials."[4]

---

[1] Waldo Abbot and Richard L. Rider, loc. cit., p. 358.

[2] Melvin R. White, loc. cit.

[3] Zettl, loc. cit.

[4] Edward Stasheff and Rudy Bretz, loc. cit., p. 76.

The difficulty in judging the relative importance of specific qualities and characteristics in their effect on the director's advancement and status with management can be appreciated even more after reading these statements by Bolen.

> A staff director, like the staff announcer, is of the most value to a station when he can do a variety of things and do them well. Perhaps the greatest staff man is one who can operate and use up only a minimum of the station's touchiest point -- money. . . . A director . . . is of the greatest value to the station when he has the ability to assemble and present a good, well-rounded piece of entertainment while using the least amount of studio and camera time and station facilities and the least amount of rehearsal time.[1]

### Personal Characteristics.

Most authors who have attempted to describe the job of the television director have commented on the importance of the director's personal traits. In some few textbooks several pages have been devoted to explanations of why the director needs certain personal qualities in order to do his work with maximum effectiveness. Other writers have summarized their thoughts regarding the director's personal characteristics in only a few lines. But in no instance has an author cited any results of research or systematic investigation to support his statement that a particular characteristic or qualification is important. Experienced directors might indeed agree as to the value of certain skills, abilities, experience, information, or characteristics. However, no survey of opinions on the subject has ever been reported in the textbooks.

An examination of what textbook writers have said about personal traits and the television director lead to some conclusions. Nearly every writer who has described the directing function has pointed out the importance of the director's personal characteristics. This suggests that the personal traits of the director are regarded by writers as a critical part of what the director brings to the job. It is also evident that the terms used by the various authors to describe the needed personal characteristics tend to be similar.

---

[1] Murray Bolen, loc. cit., pp. 151-152.

Authors have mentioned two personal characteristics more often than others in describing what kind of a person the television director should be. These two traits are the ability to get along well with people and the tendency to stay calm under pressure. Some other characteristics are also mentioned frequently.

Stasheff and Bretz devote paragraphs of explanation to the following statements:

> The director must be calm. . . .[1]
> The director must be alert. . . .[2]
> The director must be prepared for emergencies. . . .[3]
> The director must be creative. . . .[4]
> The director must be able to work with people. . . .[5]
> The director must be self-confident. . . .[6]

Kingson, Cowgill, and Levy provide paragraphs on the following "personal qualifications" of the television director:

---

[1] Edward Stasheff and Rudy Bretz, loc. cit., p. 166.

[2] Ibid., p. 167.

[3] Ibid., p. 168.

[4] Ibid., p. 172.

[5] Ibid.

[6] Ibid., p. 173.

Leadership. . . .[1]
Good Taste. . . .[2]
Creative Imagination. . . .[3]
Inquiring Mind. . . .[4]
Tact. . . .[5]
Self-Control. . . .[6]
Capacity for Detail. . . .[7]

Abbot and Rider provide comments that emphasize the director's need for self-control.

> Directing is a job that requires steady nerves, quick reactions, and lightning-fast decisions. The director must know how to work closely with many kinds of people. He must be able to work under constant tension. He must possess good taste and sound judgment. . . .[8] There may be jobs that require a higher degree of coordination, presicion, self control, and steeled nerves -- but, if there are, they are unknown to this author.[9]

Seehafer and Laemmar refer to the two most commonly mentioned personality traits needed by the television director.

> Personality is another important quality of a producer-director. He must be able to get along with people of all types and to draw the best from his talent. The producer-director must be able to give orders to temperamental performers tactfully and discreetly, yet with the firmness necessary for unquestioned control. In both planning and directing the production, he must be able to offer suggestions and take constructive criticism.

---

[1] Walter K. Kingson, Rome Cowgill, and Ralph Levy, *loc. cit.*, p. 103.

[2] *Ibid.*

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 104.

[4] *Ibid.*

[5] *Ibid.*

[6] *Ibid.*

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 105.

[8] Waldo Abbot and Richard L. Rider, *loc. cit.*

[9] *Ibid.*, p. 363.

> A producer-director must be cool under fire. When the live show or commercial is on the air, he may have to make emergency decisions on the spot. He must communicate such decisions to the cast without creating a feeling of uncertainty, commotion, or excitement in the studio.[1]

Zettl stresses the need for the director to be able to stimulate cooperation.

> . . . . You must know the potentials and limitations of the people with whom you work. You must be able to make the people work not only with you but for you. You must realize that the engineers and the floor personnel are all experts in their particular fields. A good director is not the one who knows everything better than the people he works with; but he is the one who can stimulate his associates to do their best a and who can coordinate their efforts into a unified whole, the the final television show.[2]

Bolen places heavy emphasis on the ability to handle people diplomatically.

> You will notice that the prime requisite [for television directing] is diplomacy. This is based on the fact that the success of TV depends on teamwork. Certainly it takes a diplomatic genius to coordinate and keep together the large team that works with the director. The spark of enthusiasm can mean the difference between an ordinary show and a first-rate production. Never was a field of endeavor so wide open for one who can really work with people, can make accurate snap decisions, and can organize, as the field of television program direction is.[3]

Eubank and Lawton remind us of the numerous situations that may try the director's patience.

> . . . . The director must have tact and patience. He may disagree with authors, sponsors, and agency representatives but only rarely can he tell them so. He must direct temperamental actors and musicians who can't be fired because they are under contract. He must decide to adjudicate or ignore

---

[1] Gene F. Seehafer and Jack W. Laemmar, loc. cit.

[2] Herbert Zettl, loc. cit., p. 340.

[3] Murray Bolen, loc. cit., p. 132.

> the feuds between performers and engineers. The day of the "arty" director who shouts and paces is past. The director who cannot win the respect and the best efforts of those with whom he works will soon be available for another position.[1]

In a more recent book Lawton refers briefly to the same qualities that other writers have mentioned.

> A director at a TV station needs, in addition to familiarity with his facilities and equipment, an alert sense of timing, a constant awareness that everything is dependent on him for coordination, an ability to get along with people, and a "feel" of the medium.[2]

White recommends qualities that are conducive to effective interpersonal relationships.

> He [the television director] should be mature. He should be familiar with the technical aspects and limitations of TV. He should never lose his temper. He should be courteous but firm in his dealings with all. He should be reasonable and logical at all times. He should be persuasive, not dictatorial.[3]

Hubbell does not refer directly to the matter of the director's personality, but he does stress the need for mastery of concentration and personal efficiency.

> It [television directing] calls for extensive training and study, coupled with perfect concentration on the task at hand and the ability to force oneself to work at a higher degree of of efficiency than that required for motion-picture or radio production.[4]

Special Needs of the Educational Television Director.

There tends to be an assumption that fundamentally directing is directing, whether it be in a commercial television station or in an ETV station.

---

[1] Henry L. Ewbank and Sherman P. Lawton, Broadcasting: Radio and Television (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1952), p. 388.

[2] Sherman P. Lawton, loc. cit., p. 162.

[3] Melvin R. White, loc. cit., p. 86.

[4] Richard Hubbell, loc. cit., p. 115.

The differences are seldom discussed in the literature. Very few authors have anything specific to say about directing in an educational television situation. The relatively small number of books that include much material about the directing function or about qualifications needed for directing are aimed at persons whose main concern is understanding commercial television. Few college courses are designed to train ETV directors, and the number of books that devote more than a paragraph or two to this special field is proportionately small in number.

When a distinction is made between the two areas of directing, it is usually between directing in a commercial situation and directing instructional television programs. Actually, a director who is employed in an ETV station may have very little contact with ITV programs. His involvement in instructional broadcasts will depend on the nature of that particular station's production schedule and on the pattern of assignments to the several directors.

Comments concerning the job of the director of instructional television programs provide some useful insights but rather little detail. Diamond makes an interesting point about responsibility.

> The responsibility of the director in the entertainment field differs from his responsibility in instructional television. In commercial television the director has sole authority for both content and presentation. In the educational field his responsibility is primarily production, while content and interpretation are in the domain of the television teacher.[1]

Costello and Gordon express a view which suggests a more challenging role for the ITV director.

---

[1] Robert M. Diamond, A Guide to Instructional Television (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964), p. 209.

> It is generally salutary that an instructional television director have had actual teaching experience on the level and in the subject matter field of the lesson he is directing. Also, it is probably easier and more sensible to train educators in the techniques of the medium of television (for our future supply of directors) than it is to attempt to train commercial directors to become, in the last analysis, directors.
>
> . . .
>
> Our educational television director may eventually be regarded as a new type of teacher: one who is a master of a unique medium of instruction.[1]

Mike Ambrosino makes clear the importance of the producer-director in instructional television.

> The creative ITV producer-director, sensitive to the aims and needs of education, working closely with the TV teacher, creates programing which is exciting and instructive. Directing people and ideas first, and cameras and other facilities second, his programs have pace, styple, meaning, movement, and originality.[2]

Such statements about instructional television directing can lead to some useful conclusions regarding the qualifications needed by certain directors. However, in all the literature the references to the functions and qualifications of directors who are employed in educational television stations are brief and few in number.

## C. Chapter Summary.

Looking back over the research studies that have been designed to produce information relevant to personnel needs in television directing several lines of similarity become evident. Ordinarily management personnel, usually station managers, supplied the basic data. In only one study in seven was any information collected from the directors themselves. In no case was data obtained through the immediate observation of the directing function. In all studies except one the major portion of the data was collected by mailed questionnaires. Scaled response instruments were used in two studies, one employed multiple choice questions, one requested simple quantitative and descriptive facts, and three employed questions of the open-end variety.

---

[1] Lawrence Costello and George N. Gordon, Teach with Television (New York: Hastings House, 1961), pp. 75-76.

[2] Barton L. Griffith and Donald W. MacLennan (editors), Improvement of Teaching by Television (Columbia, Missouri: University of Missouri Press, 1964), p. 221.

Basically, all of the studies were aimed at finding out more about what preparation is needed for employment in television production or directing. A specific focus on the position of the director existed in only three studies. Significant questioning concerning personal characteristics needed by television employees occurred in three studies. In nearly every study the data requested was statement of opinion. In three cases estimates were requested as to the frequency with which specific duties were performed. Objective procedures capable of identifying unrecognized factors or of providing a basis for determining the relative importance of employee characteristics were consistently absent in all of the reported research.

An examination of textbooks that deal with the subject of directing for television reveals that descriptions of the directing function and some comments concerning the qualifications needed by the director are usually supplied. However, the more colorful aspects of the director's job tend to receive more than their fair share of attention. Many authors refer chiefly to the large station or network director. Differences of opinion as to what qualifications are most needed by a director are often evident. Moreover, in the discussions of qualifications and requirements there have been very few attempts to be comprehensive. Directing in educational stations receives very little specific mention.

Probably the greatest weakness of all in the published material on requirements for the director is the lack of substantiation from research. Statements of requirements have been merely statements of opinion. No research has been cited to support the published statements as to what qualifications are most important for the television director. Undoubtedly, much of the advice from experienced author-directors is useful and sound. However, comprehensive statements are needed, and research-based facts rather than opinions are much to be desired.

# CHAPTER III

## METHOD AND PROCEDURE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this chapter is to describe the method and procedure that was used in conducting the study. The topics included were as follows: the sample group of stations used; a description of the critical incident technique; the use of the critical incident technique in this study; the personal data form and its use; and the job analysis checklist and its use.

### A. The Sample Group of Stations.

Four main considerations were taken into account when selecting the educational television stations in which data was to be collected. Those considerations were as follows:

1. The stations selected should be approximately representative of the ETV stations in the United States in respect to station size, nature and quantity of local production, and size of population in the station coverage area.
2. The stations selected should represent the types of non-commercial ETV stations in respect to classification of licensee.
3. The stations selected should be located in parts of the United States than can be reached by the investigator with a minimum of travel expense. The effort to maintain economy of expense should not endanger the quality or adequacy of the sample.
4. A quantity of data that is sufficient for the needs of the study should be available from the stations selected.

Sixteen educational television stations were selected for the sample. A list of these stations is included in the Appendix. The stations chosen satisfied the four criteria as well as any distribution that would be practical. The cities represented ranged from very large metropolitan areas to small towns. Some stations were known to be vigorous production centers and others had light production schedules. A variety of program types was also represented in the station originations.

The 16 stations selected included five licensed to universities; five licensed to schools; four licensed to community authorities; and two licensed to state authorities. Information was provided to the Carnegie Commission on Educational Television by 113 of the 114 ETV stations on the air as of June, 1966, and of these 29 were licensed to universities; 19 were licensed to schools; 41 were licensed to community authorities; and 24 were licensed to state authorities.[1] The sample does not reflect these exact proportions, because it is heavy in the direction of school stations and somewhat heavy with university stations.

Economy of travel expense was an important consideration. Fortunately, the kinds of stations that were needed for the sample were available within reasonable travel distances.

There was reason to believe that the stations selected would yield an adequate quantity of data. An earlier study conducted by this investigator tested the critical incident technique in commercial television stations and indicated that each station would yield an average of at least 15 incidents and report an average of four directors.[2] Previous experience also suggested that the incidents would tend to "pile up" in a few categories within a rather compact system of categories. Under these circumstances the anticipated number of incidents should be sufficient for the needs of the proposed study.

---

[1] Carnegie Commission on Educational Television, Public Television: A Program for Action (New York: Bantam Books, 1967), p. 239.

[2] Gale R. Adkins, A Study of Job Activities of Directors in Commercial Television Stations (Lawrence: Radio-Television Research, The University of Kansas, 1961), p. 5.

B. The Critical Incident Technique: A Brief Description.

The critical incident technique consists of a set of procedures that is designed to enable an investigator to isolate and classify direct observations of human behavior which seem to be causally related to the desired or undesired outcome of the activity involved. Dr. John C. Flanagan, the originator of the technique, points out that the identification and classification of significant behaviors.

> . . . facilitates their potential usefulness in solving practical problems and developing broad psychological principles.[1]

Reports of behaviors that are collected to serve as critical incident data are required to meet certain criteria. Although variations in criteria and procedure can be accommodated in the technique, the basic idea of the critical incident remains constant. Flanagan states

> Critical incidents are reports by qualified observers of things people did which were especially effective or ineffective in accomplishing important parts of their job.[2]

The body of data collected when using the critical incident technique includes reports of all the significant desirable and undesirable behaviors that are likely to occur in relation to the job or activity being studied.

---

[1] John C. Flanagan, "The Critical Incident Technique," Psychological Bulletin, Vol. 51 (July, 1954), p. 327.

[2] John C. Flanagan, "Defining the Requirements of a Research Executive's Job," Personnel, Vol. 28, p. 229.

In order to convert this mass of specific detail to a form that is easily reportable, a form from which inferences can be drawn and from which comparisons can be made, the data must be organized, classified and summarized.

Ordinarily the product of an analysis of critical incident data is a list of critical requirements. Flanagan says

> . . . the simplest and most natural application of a systematically collected set of critical incidents is in terms of the preparation of a statement of critical requirements.[1]

Analysis of the primary data leads to the induction and definition of categories of critical behaviors. The categories are subdivided, combined, and modified until all incidents have been classified. Finally, statements of critical requirements are carefully composed and arranged in clear and logical organization.

If the persons who were subject to observation were representative of their class, the derived system of critical requirements can be utilized in dealing with a variety of problems relating to the population represented. Flanagan reminds us that

> . . . the aim of the study is usually not a functional description of the activity as carried on by this sample but rather a statement relating to all groups of this type.[2]

Those collections of critical requirements that are applicable to other groups similar to the sample must be comprehensive, valid, and expressed at an appropriate level of specificity-generality.

Since the critical incident technique was developed in the 1940's it has been used in a wide variety of applications. Probably its greatest use has been in studies for the Armed Forces, in industry, and in education. Flanagan identifies nine areas in which the critical incident technique has been used to supply basic data.

---

[1] John C. Flanagan, "The Critical Incident Technique," Psychological Bulletin, Vol. 51 (July, 1954), p. 346.

[2] Ibid., p. 345.

> (a) Measures of typical performance (criteria); (b) measures of proficiency (standard samples); (c) training; (d) selection and classification; (e) job design and purification; (f) operating procedures; (g) equipment design; (h) motivation and leadership (attitudes); (i) counseling and psychotherapy.[1]

## C. The Nature of the Critical Incident Technique.

The basic ideas underlying the critical incident technique are both simple and familiar. Observation is one of the easiest and most direct means of acquiring information. The advantages of observing behavior in some systematic fashion have long been recognized. The critical incident technique imposes certain controlled conditions. It provides a set of procedures for systematizing observations in such a way that it is possible to analyze accumulated data and synthesize conclusions about behavioral relationships.

The critical incident technique provides an approach for breaking down a job into its component parts and arriving at conclusions regarding those parts. Essentially, it is a job analysis technique with the added advantage of a procedure for evaluating the relative importance of components. Observed behaviors that have made significant contributions either positively or negatively to the success of the activity undertaken are identified and classified. When this collection of systematically selected behaviors is analyzed and tabulated the formulation of a statement of critical requirements for that activity is possible.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 346.

Flanagan refers to the ultimate purpose of the critical incident technique when he says

> . . . A list of critical behaviors provides a sound basis for making inferences as to [job] requirements in terms of aptitudes, training, and other characteristics.[1]

The flexibility of the critical incident technique is one of its important characteristics. Flanagan underscores the desirability of adapting the technique to serve particular needs when he says

> . . . It should be emphasized that the critical incident technique does not consist of a single rigid set of rules governing such data collection. Rather it should be thought of as a flexible set of principles which must be modified and adapted to meet the specific situation at hand.[2]

Flanagan summarizes the two fundamental concepts which are basic to the critical incident technique

> . . . (a) reporting of facts regarding behavior is preferable to the collection of interpretations, ratings, and opinions based on general impressions; (b) reporting should be limited to those behaviors which, according to competent observers, make a significant contribution to the activity.[3]

The critical incident technique ordinarily involves five basic steps which were first described by Flanagan.[4] These steps begin with a thorough orientation regarding the job or activity to be studied and carry through the interpretation and evaluation of results. In terms of what is actually done by the investigator who employees the critical incident technique, these five steps constitute a functional outline of procedure.

---

[1] _Ibid._, p. 355.

[2] _Ibid._, p. 335.

[3] _Ibid._, p. 355.

[4] _Ibid._, pp. 336-346.

## Step One. General Aim of the Activity.

This should be a generalized statement which expresses the objectives of the activity in simple terms. This preliminary step is necessary before the observer can make evaluations. Obviously, it is not possible to judge whether a person is effective or ineffective in a particular activity unless the aim of that activity is understood by the observer. In the case of vocational activities, supervisory personnel can usually supply the basic concepts of purpose. Flanagan says the statement of the general aim of an activity

> . . . should be a brief statement obtained from the authorities in the field which expresses in simple terms those objectives to which most people would agree.[1]

The desirable qualities of the statement of general aim are brevity, simplicity, and generality. The greater the amount of detail in the statement of purpose, the less the likelihood of agreement among authorities who hold slightly different viewpoints and the greater the chances that the observer may pass over a pertinent fact in the belief that it is outside the definition. Flanagan points out that

> . . . the most useful statements of aims seem to center around some simple phrase or catchword which is slogan-like in character. Such words provide a maximum of communication with only a minimum of possible misinterpretation. Such words as "appreciation," "effeciency," "development," "production," and "service" are likely to be prominent in statements of general aims.[2]

## Step Two. Plans and Specifications for Gathering Data.

At this point detailed plans must be laid to insure consistent practice in observation, selection and evaluation of incidents. Observers must be chosen who fully understand the aim of the activity and are qualified to make judgments about the effectiveness of persons engaged in that activity. The conditions under which observations should be made must be described. Instructions must be formulated to guide observers in deciding whether or not a behavior is relevant to the general aim. Supervisory personnel would normally require less guidance in making such a decision than an outsider would. Flanagan suggests

---

[1] Ibid., p. 337.

[2] Ibid.

> It might be specified that any action which either directly or indirectly could be expected over a long period of time to have a significant effect on the general aim should be included.[1]

One of the most important specifications is that incidents must be critical. Inasmuch as the critical nature of the incidents accepted is vital to the effective employment of the technique, the observer must have adequate and practical criteria for selecting that which is critical. Tyson expresses an extreme position when he says a critical incident must

> . . . illustrate either satisfactory or unsatisfactory behavior that is critical in the sense that it has been observed to make the difference between success and failure in a particular aspect of a job.[2]

An incident is usually regarded as critical if it has a "significant" effect on the achievement of the general aim of the activity. Flanagan points out that "the definition of 'significant' will depend on the nature of the activity."[3] When the aim of the activity is the production or handling of tangible things the limits of significance can often be stated in objective terms. For instance, if the general aim of the activity is to assemble boxes, a significant contribution might be one that appears to cause an appreciable increase or decrease in the number of boxes assembled in a day. When the aim of the activity is to influence the attitudes or actions of people, evaluation of significance becomes more difficult. Ordinarily the investigator must then depend more on the experienced judgment of supervisors and others who are best acquainted with cause and effect in the achievement of results in that particular field.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 338.

[2] Ralph K. Tyson, The Critical Requirements for the Principalship, A Prospectus Presented to the Graduate School (Athens: The University of Georgia, 1954), p. 34.

[3] John C. Flanagan, loc. cit., p. 338.

Flanagan provides some further useful insight concerning the nature of behaviors that are suitable as data when he says that a critical incident can be

> . . . any observable type of human activity which is sufficiently complete in itself to permit inferences and predictions to be made about the person performing this act.[1]

Step Three. Collecting the Data.

After the general aim has been defined and the plans and specifications for observations have been formulated, data concerning critical incidents can be collected. Investigators have successfully employed interviews, questionnaires, record forms and direct observations as means of collecting incidents. Whatever the device used, it is important that the behaviors and results be evaluated and reported while the facts are still fresh in the mind of the observer. Incidents may be collected during on-the-spot visits by the investigator; observers may be prepared and instructed to report incidents that occur in the future; or past incidents may be recalled. Flanagan says

---

[1] John C. Flanagan, "The Critical Incident Technique in the Study of Individuals," Report of the Seventeenth Educational Conference of the American Council on Education (New York: Educational Records Bureau, 1952) p. 6.

> . . . . The critical incident technique is frequently used to collect data on observations previously made which are reported from memory.[1] . . . the efficiency, immediacy, and minimum demands on cooperating personnel which are achieved by using recalled incident data frequently make their use the more practical procedure.[2]

As a fundamental guide to the selection of incidents the observer-reporter must keep in mind the concept of what is critical. The essence of this concept is the idea that behavior is to be judged as critical if it appears to have a causal relationship to success or failure in the achievement of an important part of the job.

All the statements and questions used to elicit incidents must be planned and worded with thoughtful care. Ordinarily, several important procedural points will need to be covered in the explanatory remarks and questions. A brief reference to the general aim of the activity will usually occur. A guide to the level of incident importance should be supplied. The selection of incidents may be further tied down, perhaps by asking for the most recent observation, in order that the observer will not apply unwanted criteria such as the most dramatic incidents or those bearing out his own convictions.

The investigator must make sure that even in the course of conversation he supplies no leading remarks which might improperly influence the thinking of the respondent. Comments by the investigator during questioning should be neutral and non-directive.

---

[1] John C. Flanagan, "The Critical Incident Technique," Psychological Bulletin, Vol. 51 (July, 1954), p. 339.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 340.

A useful set of criteria is supplied by Flanagan when he states that there are several questions which the interviewer may want to apply to the incidents at the time of reporting. These questions include

> . . . (a) is the actual behavior reported; (b) was it observed by the reporter; (c) were all relevant factors in the situation given; (d) has the observer made a definite judgment regarding the criticalness of the behavior; (e) has the observer made it clear just why he believes the behavior was critical?[1]

The need for items of personal information about both the observed individual and the observer must be foreseen. Details including age, sex, education, experience, and employment history may be important in data classification or in a search for factors that correlate.

Step Four. Analyzing the Data.

The aim of the fourth step in the technique is simply to take the data that has been gathered and make it more useful for practical purposes. In general this is accomplished through descriptive grouping of incidents. The actual procedures involved include selection of a frame of reference, induction of categories, grouping similar incidents, and the phrasing of critical requirements.

The frame of reference within which such a body of incidents is to be classified can take many forms. The differences are in the nature of the factors which serve as bases for classification and the consequent wording of the heading used. Normally, the chief consideration in choosing a frame of reference is the use to be made of the results. In a study of job activities, the principal use of the requirements may be as an aid to training of personnel for the industry, selection of new personnel, or evaluation of on-the-job performance. If the intended use is to assist in planning instructional and training procedures, the classification schema would employ headings which are easily related to course objectives or training aims.

---

[1] *Ibid*., p. 342.

Whereas frame of reference may be predetermined by the use to be made of study results, the formulation of categories can develop only from the content of the data itself. The usual starting procedure is to examine a small sample of incidents and set up tentative categories. These trial categories should be in accord with the frame of reference, and each heading should emphasize some basic similarity in the behaviors placed in that group. The aim is to prepare for grouping together those incidents which are "duplicates" in the sense that they have in common some fundamental factor or characteristic that is relevant to the purpose of the study.

The degree to which main categories are broken down into sub-headings will depend on the apparent value of specific detail compared to the simplicity of a relatively small number of headings. The purposes for which the study will be used and the number of incidents in the sub-groups are fundamental considerations in deciding upon the level of specificity in the divisions and sub-divisions.

The small sample is classified under the chosen headings, modifying the headings in whatever ways seem to contribute to accurate description and homogeneous grouping. A brief definition is developed for each category and the classification of the main body of incidents begins.

Throughout the classification procedure the research must remain objective and alert to the need for redefining, sub-dividing, and combining categories. As the reworking of categories proceeds, the headings should be moved into a structure which has a clear-cut and logical organization.

Finally, all incidents have been sorted into closely related groups and subgroups; each grouping has been defined in a way that identifies the basic similarity peculiar to that group; and the over-all structure of divisions is clear and meaningful.

The remaining procedure in the fourth step is that of composing the statements of critical requirements. Flanagan's definition identifies very effectively the essential characteristics of a critical requirement.

> A critical requirement is defined as a requirement which is crucial in the sense that it has been responsible for outstandingly effective or definitely unsatisfactory performance of an important part of the job or activity in question.[1]

Each statement is derived from a category or sub-category of the critical incidents that were classified. Wording changes may be slight in some instances, but the stated requirements should be parallel in content and structure and phrased in such manner as to be the most meaningful and convenient for the intended users. Flanagan recommends that

> . . . . Headings for major areas should be neutral, not defining either unsatisfactory or outstanding behaviors. Critical requirements should ordinarily be stated in positive terms.[2]

Step Five. Interpreting and Reporting the Data.

After critical incident data has been systematically collected, classified, analyzed, and abstracted to produce statements of critical requirements, the findings and requirements can be applied to practical problems. Regarding the utility of results, Flanagan states

---

[1] John C. Flanagan, "Critical Requirements: A New Approach to Employee Evaluation," Personnel Psychology, Vol. 2, 1949, p. 420.

[2] John C. Flanagan, "The Critical Incident Technique," Psychological Bulletin, Vol. 51 (July, 1954), p. 345.

> The critical requirements for various types of activities, when expressed in terms of behavior, become useful for curriculum development, the development of achievement or evaluation measures, and the development of procedures for evaluating effectiveness in . . . these areas.[1]

Although the research may have been wisely planned, carefully developed, and the results of much potential value, Flanagan includes this final step because he feels that the responsibility of the researcher is not yet at an end. Flanagan observes

> In many cases, the real errors are made not in the collection and analysis of the data but in the failure to interpret them properly. . . . Therefore, the statement of requirements as obtained [through the critical incident technique] needs interpretation if it is to be used properly.[2]

Before the results of previous research are applied to a problem situation, the user should decide whether or not the particular application is valid and reliable. The researcher can facilitate such decisions and help prevent vulnerable generalizations by supplying a frank appraisal of his own work. The identity and possible significance of the limitations in the research should be known and understood. Any possible biases that may have been introduced by the procedures used should be pointed out and evaluated. The person who is in the best position to make these appraisals is the original investigator. Obviously, it is essential that his objectivity and integrity be maintained through the final step of interpreting, evaluating, and reporting his research.

---

[1] John C. Flanagan, "The Critical Requirements Approach to Educational Objectives," School and Society, Vol. 17, 1950, p. 323.

[2] John C. Flanagan, "The Critical Incident Technique," Psychological Bulletin, Vol. 51 (July, 1954), p. 345.

## D. The Use of the Critical Incident Technique in this Study.

A preliminary step in the use of the critical incident technique is the formulation of a statement of the general aim of the activity to be studied. This is needed to help delimit the field of investigation.

It may be said that the general aim of directing activity is to prepare and present content as effective broadcast material. In addition to preparing and conducting the minute-by-minute presentation of the material, the activity is likely to include program planning and the preparation or supervision of preparation of program material. Broadcasters recognize that the extent to which directors are expected to be responsible for the planning and preparation of broadcast material varies widely and frequently even in the same station. Variations may be due to differences in capabilities or experience of directors, available help and time, station policy, and many other factors. Variations in the specific duties of directors was not expected to complicate the job of determining critical requirements. The lists of critical behaviors and requirements would properly tend to reflect whatever is expected of directors.

The critical incident method employed in this research makes a distinction between critical and non-critical behaviors. Wagner describes these classifications as follows:

> A job may be regarded as consisting of critical and non-critical tasks or behaviors. Critical tasks are those which if done in a particularly effective or ineffective manner, will cause a qualified observer to make a judgment regarding the individual's suitability for the job. Non-critical tasks are of two kinds (1) those which have such little relation to success on the total job that the manner in which they are performed is of little consequence and (2) those which are ordinarily responsible for only minor variability in performance among job participants, that is, although they are essential parts of the total job the

> manner of performing them varies so little among workers that they are not a source of judgments regarding individual effectiveness.[1]

The nature of behaviors which are useful as data in applications of the critical incident technique is also defined by Flanagan: "(Such) incidents are defined as extreme behavior, either outstandingly effective or ineffective with respect to attaining the general aims of the activity."[2] Obviously, no attempt could be made to identify the non-critical behaviors or characteristics of television directors on the basis of the critical incident data.

The list of critical requirements produced by this research was to be essentially a list of the behaviors that are important for success in directing in an ETV station. Therefore, it was necessary that appropriate criteria for success be selected. Success in television directing might be measured in terms of salary, promotions, reputation, or excellence of productions directed. However, the measure of success used in this study was simply management's judgment that a director had behaved at a high level or at a low level of effectiveness in a stated situation. Whether or not those behaviors which were reported by management were the most reliable and valid indicators of a director's competence and ability is a question that was not within the purview of this study.

Incidents were collected during personal interviews conducted in the television stations. Although interviews conducted in a seven state area is an expensive and time-consuming way to collect data, the interview was felt to be the method that would yield the greatest number of accurately reported incidents. Location visits were made during the late summer and fall of 1966.

---

[1] R. R. Wagner, Personnel Psychology (New York, 1951), p. 293.

[2] John C. Flanagan, "The Critical Incident Technique," Psychological Bulletin, Vol. 51 (July, 1954), p. 338.

Incidents were collected from individuals who are defined in this study as management personnel. In each case the station manager was requested to recall incidents. If the manager could cite no incidents; if he seemed unfamiliar with the detailed behavior of the station's directors; or if he seldom observed the directors at work, the interviewer then requested access to other management personnel.

Incidents were always collected from the highest ranking official who (1) held general authority over directors, (2) frequently observed the directors at work, (3) had responsibility for making official judgments concerning the effectiveness of directing activity, and who (4) demonstrated by his recital of incidents that he possessed recent and detailed facts regarding the behavior of the directors. When it could be determined that a second or third station official could meet these criteria, then incidents were collected from those individuals also.

Only incidents which had occurred during the twelve months previous to the interview were collected. Older incidents were avoided because of the possibility that important details might have been forgotten.

Each interview began with a brief description of the research project and the way in which incidents would be used. Care was taken to avoid any mention of qualities or characteristics of directors, personnel or training problems, or sample incidents which might influence the nature of incidents soon to be recalled. The basic question used to elicit incidents was as follows: "Can you recall a recent incident in which one of your directors did something that made you feel very pleased or very displeased with that director?" Some gentle probing with a variation of the basic wording or with an elaboration of the question was sometimes necessary to get the train of thought started. There was consistent emphasis on the idea that only incidents of unusually effective or unusually ineffective behavior could be used.

The first step in the classification of incidents was the formulation of tentative categories. A sub-sample of 50 incidents was examined, and temporary categories and sub-categories were worded. Each trial heading described the critical behavior which was common to all of the incidents which would be grouped under that heading.

The incidents in the sub-sample were then classified under the chosen headings which were reworded, revised, combined, and divided in whatever ways seemed to contribute to accurate description and homogeneous grouping. A brief definition was then developed for each of the major categories and for any of the sub-categories that might be in any way ambiguous.

Classification of the main body of incidents followed. During the main classification procedure, categories were sometimes reworked or reworded to improve the homogeneity of grouping or to establish even clearer distinctions between categories.

In an effort to improve the accuracy of incident classification, a second classifier, an ETV station manager, worked independently and classified all incidents. The second classifier was supplied with the incident reports and the system of categories developed by the chief investigator. The second classifier was free to suggest any kind of changes. Differences in opinion as to division of categories, wording and definition of categories, and assignment of certain incidents were discussed, and mutually acceptable adjustments were made.

The final results of classifying all of the collected incidents are shown in tabular form in Chapter IV. A list of critical requirements for directors of ETV stations has been constructed on the basis of the classification of incidents. This list is included in Chapter V.

## E. The Personal Data Form and Its Use.

Personal data about each director employed in the sample of stations at the time of the interview was to be collected. A form was devised to facilitate the recording of approximately thirty items of information describing the director's background of education and experience and the nature of his responsibilities in his present job. The investigator entered the data on the form during a personal interview with each director. Respondents were assured that their names would not be identified in the study report. The body of information collected is presented in tabular form in Chapter IV. A copy of the personal data form is included in the Appendix.

## F. The Job Analysis Checklist and Its Use.

A detailed job analysis checklist had been developed by the investigator for use in an earlier study of directing in commercial television stations.[1] The list of job activities included on the original checklist was modified to accommodate the range and nature of activities performed by ETV station directors. The job analysis made no attempt to evaluate the importance or critical versus non-critical significance of the various work activities. The checklist included a four-point scale for use in indicating the extent to which each job activity was usual for the directors in a station. The revised checklist was tested in two ETV stations, and some additional changes were made before the instrument was employed in final data collection.

---

[1] Gale R. Adkins, A Study of Job Activities of Directors in Commercial Television Stations (Lawrence: Radio-Television Research, The University of Kansas, 1961).

Data for the job analysis came from the station managers except in two instances in which other management officials were better informed about such details. The information was recorded during the location visits. Tabulations showing the results of the job analysis are included in Chapter IV. A copy of the checklist is included in the Appendix.

# CHAPTER IV

# PRESENTATION OF DATA

The purpose of this chapter is to present the results of data collection and the tabulations of data. The sections of the chapter are as follows: the respondents; classification of critical incidents; personal data pertaining to the directors; and what directors do in educational television stations. All comments and discussions relating to specific tables has been reserved for Chapter V.

## A. The Respondents.

Visits to the sixteen educational television stations selected for the sample revealed that for practical purposes the sample would consist of thirteen stations. In two instances two stations operated by a single licensee shared one production studio complex. This meant that one staff of directors served two stations. One such instance involved two stations licensed to a public school system, and the other case involved two stations licensed to a state ETV authority. Still another station, licensed to a community ETV authority, had no directors, full-time or part-time, on the staff. This station was not doing any local production during a temporary period of strict economy. Therefore, the total number of stations from which data was collected was thirteen.

Among the respondents who supplied incidents were the managers of twelve of the ETV stations and the assistant manager of the thirteenth. In most stations one or more other officials on the management level also provided incidents. Table II shows the job titles of those who supplied incidents,

## TABLE II

## THE TITLES OF RESPONDENTS AND THE NUMBERS AND PERCENTAGES OF INCIDENTS PROVIDED

| Title of respondent | Number of respondents providing incidents | Number of incidents provided | Per cent of incidents provided | Average number of incidents per respondent |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Manager (station manager; general manager) | 12 | 194 | 62.58 | 16.1 |
| Program director (program manager) | 7 | 52 | 16.77 | 7.3 |
| Production manager (production supervisor; production director) | 6 | 40 | 12.90 | 6.6 |
| Operations manager | 2 | 10 | 3.22 | 5.0 |
| Assistant station manager | 1 | 9 | 2.90 | 9.0 |
| ITV coordinator | 1 | 5 | 1.61 | 5.0 |
| Total | 29 | 310 | 99.98 | |

the number and percentage of incidents provided by persons in each classification, and the average number of incidents per respondent in each classification.

### B. Classification of Critical Incidents.

The 310 incidents collected in the 13 stations were classified into categories through the procedure described in Chapter III. Table III shows the number of incidents assigned to each of 14 main categories, some of which were divided into sub-categories. Percentages are shown to indicate the relationship of main category frequencies to the total number of incidents. The analysis and discussion of Table III is included in Chapter V.

## TABLE III

## DISTRIBUTION AND PERCENTAGE OF INCIDENTS FALLING IN THE AREAS OF CLASSIFICATION

| Categories | Frequency of good incidents | Frequency of bad incidents | Frequency of incidents in the category | Per cent of the total incidents (N=310) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Proficiency in working with others. | | | 96 | 30.96 |
| A. Exercise of tact or finesse in handling potentially difficult people or awkward situations. | 19 | 4 | | |
| B. Stimulates cooperation or enthusiasm. | 15 | 7 | | |
| C. Control of temper (self-control). | 5 | 12 | | |
| D. Considerate and thoughtful of others. | 7 | 7 | | |
| E. Ability to accept criticism or suggestions. | 0 | 7 | | |
| F. Maintains control and discipline over others. | 2 | 3 | | |
| G. Maintains appropriate, discrete relationships with others involved in station activities. | 1 | 2 | | |
| H. Willingness to accept instructions from those in authority. | 0 | 3 | | |
| I. Judgment of suitability and readiness of personnel. | 2 | 0 | | |
| 2. Attitude toward the job. | | | 46 | 14.83 |
| A. Tendency to do more or less than is expected. (Working on his own time; preparation beyond the expected; assisting when not obligated; wasting time.) | 30 | 3 | | |
| B. Willingness to work on a certain assignment. (Feeling an assignment is not important or challenging; enthusiasm for a particular assignment; willing to work at things less important than directing.) | 3 | 10 | | |

TABLE III - CONTINUED

| Categories | Frequency of good incidents | Frequency of bad incidents | Frequency of incidents in the category | Per cent of the total incidents (N=310) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3. Effectiveness in planning or achieving communication through television. (Use of audio-visual elements to achieve effective communication; translating concepts or content points into TV communication; understanding and use of audience interest; application of imigination or originality; knowing what will be effective TV.) | 21 | 19 | 40 | 12.58 |
| 4. Organization or planning of procedures and details. (Pre-production planning; planning that does not require quick thinking.) | 11 | 15 | 26 | 8.38 |
| 5. Reliability in the handling of details. | | | 24 | 7.74 |
| A. Devoting careful attention to the details of on-the-air directing. | 0 | 8 | | |
| B. Correctness in preparation and submission of forms. | 2 | 2 | | |
| C. Checking art work in advance. | 1 | 2 | | |
| D. Checking slides in advance. | 0 | 3 | | |
| E. Checking lighting in advance. | 0 | 2 | | |
| F. Checking script for errors. | 1 | 0 | | |
| G. Checking framing of visuals in advance. | 1 | 0 | | |
| H. Checking number of videotape used. | 0 | 1 | | |
| I. Following through on all details. | 1 | 0 | | |
| 6. Punctuality. | | | 14 | 4.51 |
| A. Meeting deadlines. (For scripts, forms, paperwork.) | 0 | 6 | | |
| B. Keeping productions on schedule. (Getting started on time; getting out of the studio on time; finishing in reasonable time.) | 1 | 4 | | |
| C. Keeping appointments on time. | 0 | 3 | | |

## TABLE III - CONTINUED

| Categories | Frequency of good incidents | Frequency of bad incidents | Frequency of incidents in the category | Per cent of the total incidents (N=310) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 7. Knowledge of television equipment and television production materials. (Behaviors involving primarily an understanding of equipment or materials. Does not include imagination or originality in use.) | | | 13 | 4.19 |
| A. Knowledge of sets and scenery. | 1 | 3 | | |
| B. Knowledge of TV cameras and lenses. | 1 | 2 | | |
| C. Knowledge of lighting. | 0 | 2 | | |
| D. Knowledge of the television system. | 0 | 1 | | |
| E. Knowledge of visual and graphic materials. | 1 | 1 | | |
| F. Knowledge of switching equipment. | 1 | 0 | | |
| 8. Quick and calm thinking. | | | 12 | 3.87 |
| A. In adjusting when the unexpected happens during production. | 6 | 2 | | |
| B. In deciding on camera shots or camera movement. | 1 | 3 | | |
| 9. Inter-personal communication. (Giving instructions; understanding messages.) | | | 11 | 3.54 |
| A. During planning or preparation. | 1 | 8 | | |
| B. While production is in progress. (Including use of intercom.) | 0 | 2 | | |
| 10. Application of station policies. (Compliance with policies and application of policies.) | | | 9 | 2.90 |
| A. Regarding the limits of the director's authority. | 0 | 5 | | |
| B. Regarding purchase of items. | 0 | 2 | | |
| C. Contributing to a good station image. | 1 | 1 | | |

TABLE III - CONTINUED

| Categories | Frequency of good incidents | Frequency of bad incidents | Frequency of incidents in the category | Per cent of the total incidents (N=310) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 11. Understanding and application of educational aims, principles, or viewpoint. | 2 | 6 | 8 | 2.58 |
| 12. Attitudes of self-regard. | | | | |
| A. Exaggerated idea of importance of himself or his activities. | 0 | 2 | 4 | 1.29 |
| B. Self-confidence. | 2 | 0 | | |
| 13. Honesty. (Proper regard for the truth.) | 0 | 4 | 4 | 1.29 |
| 14. Cleanliness and neatness. (Personal cleanliness; leaving facilities neat and orderly.) | 0 | 3 | 3 | .96 |
| TOTAL | 140 | 170 | 310 | 99.62 |

## C. Personal Data Pertaining to the Directors.

In the 13 educational television stations 73 people were found to be engaged in directing, either on a full-time or on a part-time basis. Information about the age, education, employment experience, job assignment, and certain other related matters was obtained from or about each of the 73 directors. In all but five instances, information was collected from the directors themselves during the location visit. Four data forms were administered by mail, and management personnel supplied partial data about one individual.

Tables IV through XXXI show the tabulations of the personal data pertaining to the directors in the sample group of stations.

TABLE IV

SEX OF DIRECTORS IN THE SAMPLE OF STATIONS

| Sex | Number of directors | Per cent of directors |
|---|---|---|
| Male | 68 | 93.15 |
| Female | 5 | 6.84 |
| Total | 73 | 99.99 |

## TABLE V

## JOB TITLES OF PERSONS DIRECTING PROGRAMS IN THE SAMPLE STATIONS

| Job title | Number of directors | Per cent of directors |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Producer-director | 44 | 60.27 |
| 2. Production manager (production supervisor; production director) | 9 | 12.32 |
| 3. Director | 6 | 8.21 |
| 4. Program director | 2 | 2.73 |
| 5. Operations manager (operations director) | 2 | 2.73 |
| 6. Manager | 2 | 2.73 |
| 7. Executive producer | 1 | 1.36 |
| 8. CCTV coordinator | 1 | 1.36 |
| 9. Academic coordinator | 1 | 1.36 |
| 10. ITV coordinator | 1 | 1.36 |
| 11. Assistant producer | 1 | 1.36 |
| 12. Special projects producer | 1 | 1.36 |
| 13. Assistant production manager | 1 | 1.36 |
| 14. Film director | 1 | 1.36 |
| Total | 73 | 99.87 |

## TABLE VI

## AGE OF DIRECTORS IN THE SAMPLE OF STATIONS

| Age groups | Number of directors | Per cent of directors |
|---|---|---|
| 20 through 24 years of age | 11 | 15.04 |
| 25 through 29 years of age | 22 | 30.08 |
| 30 through 34 years of age | 22 | 30.08 |
| 35 through 39 years of age | 8 | 10.92 |
| 40 through 44 years of age | 4 | 5.46 |
| 45 through 49 years of age | 4 | 5.46 |
| 50 through 54 years of age | 0 | |
| 55 through 59 years of age | 1 | 1.36 |
| 60 through 64 years of age | 1 | 1.36 |
| Total | 73 | 99.76 |

## TABLE VII

## NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF DIRECTORS WHO DEVOTE FULL TIME OR PART TIME TO DIRECTING

| | Number of directors | Per cent of directors |
|---|---|---|
| Devote full time to directing | 37 | 50.68 |
| Devote part time to directing | 36 | 49.31 |
| Total | 73 | 99.99 |

## TABLE VIII

## NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF DIRECTORS WHO SERVE AS PRODUCERS

| | Number of directors | Per cent of directors |
|---|---|---|
| Those who serve as producers | 61 | 83.56 |
| Those who do not serve as producers | 12 | 16.43 |
| Total | 73 | 99.99 |

## TABLE IX

## NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF DIRECTORS WITH NON-DIRECTING DUTIES

| Non-directing duties | Number of directors | Per cent of directors |
|---|---|---|
| Those who have some non-directing duties | 43 | 58.90 |
| Those who have no non-directing duties | 30 | 41.10 |
| Total | 73 | 100.00 |

## TABLE X

## NON-DIRECTING DUTIES OF DIRECTORS IN THE SAMPLE OF STATIONS[1]

| Duties | Number of directors[2] | Per cent of directors (N=73) |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Teaching | 9 | 12.32 |
| 2. Serve as production manager (production director) | 9 | 12.32 |
| 3. Serve as cameraman | 5 | 6.84 |
| 4. Serve as floor manager | 5 | 6.84 |
| 5. Help with traffic log | 5 | 6.84 |
| 6. Help with promotion work | 5 | 6.84 |
| 7. Serve as announcer | 3 | 4.10 |
| 8. Responsibilities for art work | 3 | 4.10 |
| 9. Serve as program director | 2 | 2.73 |
| 10. Serve as operations manager (operations director) | 2 | 2.73 |
| 11. Serve as station manager | 2 | 2.73 |
| 12. Serve as studio manager | 2 | 2.73 |
| 13. Serve as ITV coordinator (ITV supervisor) | 2 | 2.73 |
| 14. Preview films | 2 | 2.73 |
| 15. Ordering of supplies | 2 | 2.73 |
| 16. Write scripts | 2 | 2.73 |
| 17. Serve as slide librarian | 2 | 2.73 |
| 18. Serve as music director | 2 | 2.73 |
| 19. Help with staging | 2 | 2.73 |
| 20. Help with lighting | 2 | 2.73 |
| 21. Serve as executive producer | 1 | 1.36 |
| 22. Serve as CCTV coordinator | 1 | 1.36 |
| 23. Serve as academic coordinator | 1 | 1.36 |
| 24. Serve as research assistant | 1 | 1.36 |
| 25. Serve as assistant producer | 1 | 1.36 |
| 26. Serve as special projects producer | 1 | 1.36 |
| 27. Serve as assistant production manager | 1 | 1.36 |
| 28. Serve as sports announcer | 1 | 1.36 |
| 29. Serve as radio program director | 1 | 1.36 |
| 30. Serve as record librarian | 1 | 1.36 |
| 31. Serve as utilization supervisor | 1 | 1.36 |
| 32. Serve as floorman | 1 | 1.36 |
| 33. Do film editing | 1 | 1.36 |
| 34. Do videotape editing | 1 | 1.36 |
| 35. Help with set design and construction | 1 | 1.36 |
| 36. Serve as engineer | 1 | 1.36 |
| 37. No non-directing duties | 30 | 41.09 |

---

[1] These responses do not refer to activities which may be involved in the director's preparation of a program which he himself directs.

[2] This column adds to a number greater than 73 because some directors reported more than one non-directing duty.

## TABLE XI

## NUMBER OF YEARS OF COLLEGE COMPLETED BY DIRECTORS IN THE SAMPLE OF STATIONS

| Number of years | Number of directors | Per cent of directors |
|---|---|---|
| One year | 1 | 1.36 |
| Two years | 0 | |
| Three years | 3 | 4.10 |
| Four years | 23 | 31.50 |
| Five years | 22 | 30.13 |
| Six years | 15 | 20.54 |
| Seven years | 2 | 2.73 |
| Eight years | 3 | 4.10 |
| Nine years | 2 | 2.73 |
| None | 2 | 2.73 |
| Total | 73 | 99.92 |

## TABLE XII

## YEARS IN WHICH DIRECTORS IN THE SAMPLE LAST ATTENDED COLLEGE

| Last year attended college | Number of directors | Per cent of directors |
|---|---|---|
| No college | 2 | 2.73 |
| 1939 | 1 | 1.36 |
| . . . . . | | |
| 1949 | 1 | 1.36 |
| 1950 | 1 | 1.36 |
| 1951 | 0 | |
| 1952 | 1 | 1.36 |
| 1953 | 0 | |
| 1954 | 2 | 2.73 |
| 1955 | 2 | 2.73 |
| 1956 | 1 | 1.36 |
| 1957 | 4 | 5.47 |
| 1958 | 1 | 1.36 |
| 1959 | 6 | 8.21 |
| 1960 | 4 | 5.47 |
| 1961 | 3 | 4.10 |
| 1962 | 6 | 8.21 |
| 1963 | 6 | 8.21 |
| 1964 | 9 | 12.32 |
| 1965 | 4 | 5.47 |
| 1966 | 19 | 26.01 |
| Total | 73 | 99.82 |

## TABLE XIII

## HIGHEST DEGREE HELD BY DIRECTORS IN THE SAMPLE OF STATIONS

| Degree | Number of directors | Per cent of directors |
|---|---|---|
| No degree | 12 | 16.42 |
| Bachelor's degree | 31 | 42.46 |
| Master's degree | 28 | 38.35 |
| Doctoral degree | 2 | 2.73 |
| Total | 73 | 99.96 |

## TABLE XIV

## NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF DIRECTORS WHO COMPLETED EITHER AN UNDERGRADUATE MAJOR OR A GRADUATE MAJOR IN BROADCASTING

| | Number of directors | Per cent of directors |
|---|---|---|
| Have completed a major in broadcasting | 49 | 67.12 |
| Have never worked toward or have never completed a major in broadcasting | 24 | 32.87 |
| Total | 73 | 99.99 |

## TABLE XV

## LAST MAJOR FIELD STUDIED IN COLLEGE BY THE DIRECTORS IN THE SAMPLE

| Last major field studied | Number of directors | Per cent of directors |
|---|---|---|
| Radio-TV (broadcasting) | 48 | 65.75 |
| Education | 6 | 8.21 |
| Speech | 4 | 5.47 |
| Theatre (dramatic art) | 4 | 5.47 |
| Business | 3 | 4.10 |
| No college study | 3 | 4.10 |
| English | 2 | 2.73 |
| Sociology | 1 | 1.36 |
| Art | 1 | 1.36 |
| Journalism | 1 | 1.36 |
| Total | 73 | 99.91 |

## TABLE XVI

## NUMBER OF YEARS DIRECTORS WERE EMPLOYED IN RADIO

| Number of years | Number of directors | Per cent of directors |
|---|---|---|
| None | 47 | 64.38 |
| One year or less | 10 | 13.69 |
| Two years | 6 | 8.21 |
| Three years | 1 | 1.36 |
| Four years | 6 | 8.21 |
| Five years | 1 | 1.36 |
| Six years | 2 | 2.73 |
| Total | 73 | 99.94 |

## TABLE XVII

## AREAS OF PAST EMPLOYMENT IN RADIO WHICH WERE REPORTED BY THE DIRECTORS

| Areas of employment | Number of directors[1] | Per cent of directors (N=73) |
|---|---|---|
| No employment in radio | 47 | 64.38 |
| Announcing | 17 | 23.27 |
| News | 7 | 9.58 |
| Writing (continuity; copy) | 5 | 6.84 |
| Director (producer-director) | 4 | 5.47 |
| Sales | 3 | 4.10 |
| Program director | 2 | 2.73 |
| Music programming | 1 | 1.36 |
| Public relations | 1 | 1.36 |
| Sound effects | 1 | 1.36 |
| Production assistant | 1 | 1.36 |

[1] This column adds to a number greater than 73 because some directors reported more than one area of employment.

## TABLE XVIII

## STARTING JOBS OF DIRECTORS AT THE STATION OF CURRENT EMPLOYMENT

| Starting Job | Number of directors | Per cent of directors |
|---|---|---|
| Producer-director | 39 | 53.42 |
| Cameraman | 8 | 10.95 |
| Production assistant | 6 | 8.21 |
| Floorman | 5 | 6.84 |
| Director | 2 | 2.73 |
| Producer | 2 | 2.73 |
| Assistant producer | 2 | 2.73 |
| Art director | 2 | 2.73 |
| Staging | 1 | 1.36 |
| Carpenter | 1 | 1.36 |
| Writer | 1 | 1.36 |
| Floor manager | 1 | 1.36 |
| Film director | 1 | 1.36 |
| Technical director | 1 | 1.36 |
| Art assistant | 1 | 1.36 |
| Total | 73 | 99.86 |

## TABLE XIX

### NUMBER OF YEARS EACH DIRECTOR HAS BEEN EMPLOYED AT THE STATION OF CURRENT EMPLOYMENT

| Number of years | Number of directors | Per cent of directors |
|---|---|---|
| Less than a full year | 11 | 15.06 |
| One year | 8 | 10.95 |
| Two years | 8 | 10.95 |
| Three years | 9 | 12.32 |
| Four years | 6 | 8.21 |
| Five years | 6 | 8.21 |
| Six years | 7 | 9.58 |
| Seven years | 4 | 5.47 |
| Eight years | 5 | 6.84 |
| Nine years | 1 | 1.36 |
| Ten years | 5 | 6.84 |
| Eleven years | 0 | |
| Twelve years | 2 | 2.73 |
| Thirteen years | 1 | 1.36 |
| Total | 73 | 99.88 |

## TABLE XX

## NUMBER OF YEARS EACH DIRECTOR HAS SERVED AS A DIRECTOR AT THE STATION OF CURRENT EMPLOYMENT

| Number of years | Number of directors | Per cent of directors |
|---|---|---|
| Less than a full year | 14 | 19.17 |
| One year | 12 | 16.43 |
| Two years | 8 | 10.95 |
| Three years | 8 | 10.95 |
| Four years | 8 | 10.95 |
| Five years | 4 | 5.47 |
| Six years | 8 | 10.95 |
| Seven years | 2 | 2.73 |
| Eight years | 2 | 2.73 |
| Nine years | 1 | 1.36 |
| Ten years | 4 | 5.47 |
| Eleven years | 0 | |
| Twelve years | 1 | 1.36 |
| Thirteen years | 1 | 1.36 |
| Total | 73 | 99.88 |

## TABLE XXI

## NUMBER OF COMMERCIAL TELEVISION STATIONS IN WHICH EACH DIRECTOR HAS BEEN EMPLOYED

| Number of stations | Number of directors | Per cent of directors |
|---|---|---|
| None | 19 | 26.02 |
| One station | 38 | 52.05 |
| Two stations | 8 | 10.95 |
| Three stations | 4 | 5.47 |
| Four stations | 3 | 4.10 |
| . . . . . | | |
| Nine stations | 1 | 1.36 |
| Total | 73 | 99.95 |

## TABLE XXII

## NUMBER OF EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION STATIONS IN WHICH EACH DIRECTOR HAS BEEN EMPLOYED

| Number of stations | Number of directors | Per cent of directors |
|---|---|---|
| One station (the station of current employment) | 56 | 76.71 |
| Two stations | 14 | 19.17 |
| Three stations | 2 | 2.73 |
| Four stations | 1 | 1.36 |
| Total | 73 | 99.97 |

## TABLE XXIII

## JOBS IN TELEVISION BESIDES DIRECTOR OR PRODUCER-DIRECTOR WHICH HAVE BEEN HELD BY THE DIRECTORS IN THE SAMPLE, INCLUDING CURRENT JOB ASSIGNMENTS

| TV jobs other than director or producer-director | Number of directors[1] | Per cent of directors (N=73) |
|---|---|---|
| Cameraman | 29 | 39.71 |
| Production assistant | 12 | 16.43 |
| Production manager (production director) | 10 | 13.69 |
| Floorman | 10 | 13.69 |
| Announcer | 8 | 10.95 |
| Floor manager (floor director) | 7 | 9.58 |
| Lighting | 7 | 9.58 |
| Promotion | 6 | 8.21 |
| Program director | 6 | 8.21 |
| Traffic | 5 | 6.84 |
| Script writer | 5 | 6.84 |
| Operations manager (operations director) | 4 | 5.47 |
| News reporter | 3 | 4.10 |
| Studio manager | 3 | 4.10 |
| Audio operator | 3 | 4.10 |
| Assistant director | 3 | 4.10 |
| Film cameraman | 3 | 4.10 |
| Art work | 3 | 4.10 |
| Sets and staging | 3 | 4.10 |
| Engineering (video) | 3 | 4.10 |
| Projectionist | 3 | 4.10 |
| Assistant producer | 3 | 4.10 |
| Technical director | 2 | 2.73 |
| Music director | 2 | 2.73 |
| Manager | 2 | 2.73 |
| ITV coordinator | 2 | 2.73 |
| Actor | 2 | 2.73 |
| Film director | 2 | 2.73 |
| Lighting supervisor | 2 | 2.73 |
| Film librarian | 2 | 2.73 |
| Videotape editing | 1 | 1.36 |
| CCTV supervisor | 1 | 1.36 |
| Executive producer | 1 | 1.36 |
| Academic coordinator | 1 | 1.36 |
| Research assistant | 1 | 1.36 |
| Special projects producer | 1 | 1.36 |
| Assistant production manager | 1 | 1.36 |
| Assistant ITV coordinator | 1 | 1.36 |
| Studio supervisor | 1 | 1.36 |
| News director | 1 | 1.36 |
| Associate producer | 1 | 1.36 |
| Utilization supervisor | 1 | 1.36 |
| Film editor | 1 | 1.36 |
| Make-up | 1 | 1.36 |

---

[1] This column adds to a number greater than 73 because many directors reported experience in more than one job.

## TABLE XXIV

## NUMBER OF YEARS EACH DIRECTOR HAS BEEN EMPLOYED IN TELEVISION

| Number of years | Number of directors | Per cent of directors |
|---|---|---|
| Less than a full year | 1 | 1.36 |
| One year | 1 | 1.36 |
| Two years | 3 | 4.10 |
| Three years | 7 | 9.58 |
| Four years | 8 | 10.95 |
| Five years | 7 | 9.58 |
| Six years | 8 | 10.95 |
| Seven years | 4 | 5.47 |
| Eight years | 5 | 6.84 |
| Nine years | 7 | 9.58 |
| Ten years | 8 | 10.95 |
| Eleven years | 3 | 4.10 |
| Twelve years | 3 | 4.10 |
| Thirteen years | 5 | 6.84 |
| Fourteen years | 1 | 1.36 |
| Fifteen years | 2 | 2.73 |
| Total | 73 | 99.87 |

## TABLE XXV

## NUMBER OF YEARS OF DIRECTING EXPERIENCE REPORTED BY THE DIRECTORS

| Number of years | Number of directors | Per cent of directors |
|---|---|---|
| Less than a full year | 6 | 8.21 |
| One year | 5 | 6.84 |
| Two years | 9 | 12.32 |
| Three years | 9 | 12.32 |
| Four years | 8 | 10.95 |
| Five years | 3 | 4.10 |
| Six years | 10 | 13.69 |
| Seven years | 5 | 6.84 |
| Eight years | 1 | 1.36 |
| Nine years | 4 | 5.47 |
| Ten years | 7 | 9.58 |
| Eleven years | 2 | 2.73 |
| Twelve years | 1 | 1.36 |
| Thirteen years | 1 | 1.36 |
| Fourteen years | 0 | |
| Fifteen years | 1 | 1.36 |
| Sixteen years | 0 | |
| Seventeen years | 1 | 1.36 |
| Total | 73 | 99.85 |

## TABLE XXVI

## NUMBER OF YEARS OF PAST EMPLOYMENT OUTSIDE TELEVISION AND RADIO REPORTED BY THE DIRECTORS

| Number of years | Number of directors | Per cent of directors |
|---|---|---|
| One year or less | 15 | 20.54 |
| Two years | 7 | 9.58 |
| Three years | 7 | 9.58 |
| Four years | 4 | 5.47 |
| Five years | 1 | 1.36 |
| Six years | 0 | |
| Seven years | 4 | 5.47 |
| Eight years | 1 | 1.36 |
| Nine years | 0 | |
| Ten years | 1 | 1.36 |
| Eleven years | 1 | 1.36 |
| Twelve years | 0 | |
| Thirteen years | 0 | |
| Fourteen years | 1 | 1.36 |
| Fifteen years | 0 | |
| Sixteen years | 2 | 2.73 |
| . . . . . | | |
| Twenty-four years | 1 | 1.36 |
| . . . . . | | |
| Thirty-one years | 1 | 1.36 |
| None | 27 | 36.98 |
| Total | 73 | 99.87 |

## TABLE XXVII

## AREAS OF PAST EMPLOYMENT OUTSIDE TELEVISION AND RADIO REPORTED BY THE DIRECTORS

| Area of employment | Number of directors[1] | Per cent of directors (N=73) |
|---|---|---|
| None | 27 | 36.98 |
| Unskilled labor | 19 | 25.93 |
| Sales | 18 | 24.57 |
| Teaching | 10 | 13.69 |
| Skilled trades | 7 | 9.57 |
| TV or film production (not in a station) | 5 | 6.84 |
| Agriculture | 4 | 5.47 |
| Small business management | 4 | 5.47 |
| Advertising | 3 | 4.10 |
| Theatre | 2 | 2.73 |
| Photography | 2 | 2.73 |
| Engineering | 1 | 1.36 |

[1] This column adds to a number greater than 73 because some directors reported more than one area of past employment.

## TABLE XXVIII

## NUMBER OF SHOWS DIRECTED PER WEEK BY THE DIRECTORS IN THE SAMPLE

| Number of shows | Number of directors | Per cent of directors |
|---|---|---|
| Less than one | 6 | 8.21 |
| One show | 10 | 13.69 |
| Two shows | 7 | 9.58 |
| Three shows | 15 | 20.54 |
| Four shows | 8 | 10.95 |
| Five shows | 7 | 9.58 |
| Six shows | 4 | 5.47 |
| Seven shows | 2 | 2.73 |
| Eight shows | 3 | 4.10 |
| Nine shows | 0 | |
| Ten shows | 3 | 4.10 |
| Eleven shows | 3 | 4.10 |
| Twelve shows | 0 | |
| Thirteen shows | 1 | 1.36 |
| Fourteen shows | 0 | |
| Fifteen shows | 1 | 1.36 |
| Sixteen shows | 0 | |
| Seventeen shows | 0 | |
| Eighteen shows | 1 | 1.36 |
| Nineteen shows | 1 | 1.36 |
| . . . . . | | |
| Twenty-five shows | 1 | 1.36 |
| Total | 73 | 99.86 |

## TABLE XXIX

## PROPORTION OF SHOWS DIRECTED WHICH WERE PRODUCED BY THE DIRECTORS IN THE SAMPLE

| Proportion of shows produced by the director | Number of directors | Per cent of directors |
|---|---|---|
| No shows produced | 12 | 16.43 |
| Produces all shows he directs | 40 | 54.78 |
| Produces about half of the shows he directs | 19 | 26.01 |
| Produces about one-fourth of the shows he directs | 2 | 2.73 |
| Total | 73 | 99.95 |

## TABLE XXX

## NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF DIRECTORS THAT NAMED CERTAIN ASPECTS OF THE DIRECTING JOB AS LEAST DESIRABLE

Question: "What part of your (director; producer-director) job do you feel is least satisfying or least desirable?"

| Least desirable aspect of directing | Number of directors | Per cent of directors |
|---|---|---|
| Working with poorly qualified personnel (people not accustomed to TV; amateurs; unskilled staff; disinterested people) | 18 | 24.65 |
| Paper work | 13 | 17.80 |
| Shortage of time (deadlines) | 9 | 12.32 |
| Problems with engineers | 6 | 8.21 |
| Making arrangements (footwork) | 4 | 5.47 |
| Finding talent | 3 | 4.10 |
| Lighting sets | 3 | 4.10 |
| Doing very simple programs | 3 | 4.10 |
| Early pre-planning of programs | 2 | 2.73 |
| Sharing planning or production authority | 2 | 2.73 |
| Scripting (developing verbal content of script) | 2 | 2.73 |
| Contacting people | 1 | 1.36 |
| Finding visual materials | 1 | 1.36 |
| Bad hours | 1 | 1.36 |
| Doing a program over | 1 | 1.36 |
| Shortage of production funds | 1 | 1.36 |
| Shooting film | 1 | 1.36 |
| Selecting music | 1 | 1.36 |
| No answer | 1 | 1.36 |
| Total | 73 | 99.82 |

## TABLE XXXI

## NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF THE DIRECTORS THAT NAMED CERTAIN AREAS OF TRAINING OR BACKGROUND AS MOST DESIRED

Question: "What training or background do you sometimes wish you had more of?"

| Training or background most desired | Number of directors | Per cent of directors |
|---|---|---|
| Engineering (electronics; technical aspects) | 13 | 17.80 |
| Film (film making; film production) | 8 | 10.95 |
| Psychology (how to handle people; how people learn) | 7 | 9.58 |
| Music | 6 | 8.21 |
| Education courses (teaching theory and practice; teaching procedures) | 5 | 6.84 |
| Liberal arts | 4 | 5.47 |
| Staging | 3 | 4.10 |
| Directing for TV (experience or courses) | 3 | 4.10 |
| Stage directing | 2 | 2.73 |
| Lighting | 2 | 2.73 |
| Art | 2 | 2.73 |
| Languages (foreign) | 2 | 2.73 |
| Scene design | 2 | 2.73 |
| English | 2 | 2.73 |
| Writing for TV | 2 | 2.73 |
| Graphics and visuals | 2 | 2.73 |
| Make-up | 1 | 1.36 |
| Political science | 1 | 1.36 |
| Management | 1 | 1.36 |
| Public relations | 1 | 1.36 |
| Photography | 1 | 1.36 |
| Inter-personal communication | 1 | 1.36 |
| Copyright law | 1 | 1.36 |
| No answer | 1 | 1.36 |
| Total | 73 | 99.77 |

## D. What Directors Do in Educational Television Stations.

The job analysis checklist was used at each of the 13 stations to identify the work activities performed by the directors employed in the station. The instrument was designed as a checklist of specific items in order to facilitate and systematize the recording of information. A particular effort was made to identify any work activities which were not already listed in the instrument. However, the identification and quantification of non-directing duties performed by directors is presented in greater detail in Table X in the previous section. That table reports data collected during individual interviews with directors.

The recording of data on the checklist involved the use of a four point scale for indicating the extent to which each job activity was usual for the directors in a station. Table XXXII shows the results of the inventory of director's duties. Frequencies and percentages are shown in each of four columns which are headed with the definitions used on the four point scale.

A few work activities not included on the checklist were identified during the interviews. Those items were added to the list for all subsequent interviews. The added items are shown on the last page of the table, and the number of stations that had a chance to respond to each specific item is shown.

### TABLE XXXII

### WORK ACTIVITIES OF DIRECTORS IN THE SAMPLE OF EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION STATIONS

| Work Activities | A NORMAL responsibility for all directors at this station | | A NORMAL responsibility for some directors but not for all | | NOT A NORMAL responsibility for ANY director but is sometimes done by a director | | NOT DONE by any of our directors | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| Direct studio productions | 13 | 100.00 | | | | | | |
| Conduct rehearsals | 13 | 100.00 | | | | | | |
| Direct remote productions | 6 | 46.14 | 3 | 23.07 | | | 4 | 30.76 |
| Direct station breaks and announcements | 1 | 7.69 | 2 | 15.38 | 3 | 23.07 | 7 | 53.84 |
| Supervise on-the-air operations during tape or film programs | 4 | 30.76 | 1 | 7.69 | 1 | 7.69 | 7 | 53.84 |
| Direct filming of program segments, news, etc. (film production) | 5 | 38.45 | 6 | 46.14 | 1 | 7.69 | 1 | 7.69 |
| Serve as producer for programs he is to direct | 9 | 69.22 | 3 | 23.07 | 1 | 7.69 | | |
| Serve as producer for programs he does not direct | 2 | 15.38 | 2 | 15.38 | 5 | 38.45 | 4 | 30.76 |
| Think up ideas for new programs or series | 7 | 53.84 | 2 | 15.38 | 3 | 23.07 | 1 | 7.69 |
| Serve as production specialist when working with a producer | 7 | 53.84 | 2 | 15.38 | 2 | 15.38 | 2 | 15.38 |
| Consult with talent regarding the materials and methods of presentation | 12 | 92.30 | 1 | 7.69 | | | | |
| Consult with talent regarding the content of the program | 6 | 46.14 | 2 | 15.38 | 3 | 23.07 | 2 | 15.38 |

## TABLE XXXII (CONTINUED)

| Work Activities | A NORMAL responsibility for all directors at this station | | A NORMAL responsibility for some directors but not for all | | NOT A NORMAL responsibility for ANY director but is sometimes done by a director | | NOT DONE by any of our directors | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| Check for errors in script or copy he is to direct | 13 | 100.00 | | | | | | |
| Edit and make minor changes in script or copy he is to direct | 7 | 53.84 | 5 | 38.45 | 1 | 7.69 | | |
| Prepare run-down sheets or skeleton scripts | 7 | 53.84 | 2 | 15.38 | 3 | 23.07 | 1 | 7.69 |
| Write announcements or continuity | 1 | 7.69 | 3 | 23.07 | 6 | 46.14 | 3 | 23.07 |
| Write news copy | | | | | | | 13 | 100.00 |
| Write special program or special series scripts | 3 | 23.07 | 2 | 15.38 | 5 | 38.45 | 3 | 23.07 |
| Write documentary scripts | 3 | 23.07 | 2 | 15.38 | 3 | 23.07 | 5 | 38.45 |
| Plan promotional materials | 1 | 7.69 | 2 | 15.38 | 4 | 30.76 | 6 | 46.14 |
| Write promotional materials | 1 | 7.69 | 2 | 15.38 | 2 | 15.38 | 8 | 61.53 |
| Write utilization materials | | | | | 2 | 15.38 | 11 | 84.60 |
| Consult with others regarding utilization materials | | | 4 | 30.76 | 33 | 23.07 | 6 | 46.14 |
| Describe needs or select sets and scenery for his production | 12 | 92.30 | 1 | 7.69 | | | | |
| Describe needs or select set lighting and lighting effects | 13 | 100.00 | | | | | | |
| Describe needs or select still pictures | 11 | 84.60 | 1 | 7.69 | 1 | 7.69 | | |
| Describe needs or select films and slides | 11 | 84.60 | 1 | 7.69 | 1 | 7.69 | | |
| Describe needs or select properties | 11 | 84.60 | 1 | 7.69 | 1 | 7.69 | | |

TABLE XXXII (CONTINUED)

| Work Activities | A NORMAL responsibility for all directors at this station | | A NORMAL responsibility for some directors but not for all | | NOT A NORMAL responsibility for ANY director but is sometimes done by a director | | NOT DONE by any of our directors | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| Describe needs or select on-camera graphics | 11 | 84.60 | 1 | 7.69 | 1 | 7.69 | | |
| Describe needs or select sound effects | 12 | 92.30 | 1 | 7.69 | | | | |
| Describe needs or select costumes | 11 | 84.60 | 1 | 7.69 | 1 | 7.69 | | |
| Describe needs or select music and musical effects | 12 | 92.30 | 1 | 7.69 | | | | |
| Describe needs or select special studio effects | 12 | 92.30 | 1 | 7.69 | | | | |
| Give instructions for make-up needed by talent | 11 | 84.60 | 1 | 7.69 | 1 | 7.69 | | |
| Hunt for films, slides or stills for production use | 10 | 76.91 | 1 | 7.69 | 2 | 15.38 | | |
| Screen and prepare films for film programs | 5 | 38.45 | 2 | 15.38 | 2 | 15.38 | 4 | 30.76 |
| Design sets or scenery | 3 | 23.07 | 4 | 30.76 | 5 | 38.45 | 1 | 7.69 |
| Help construct sets or scenery | 2 | 15.38 | 3 | 23.07 | 2 | 15.38 | 6 | 46.14 |
| Help put in place or remove sets | 4 | 30.76 | | | 4 | 30.76 | 5 | 38.45 |
| Assemble props or on-camera materials | 3 | 23.07 | 4 | 30.76 | 4 | 30.76 | 2 | 15.38 |
| Help arrange lighting equipment | 1 | 7.69 | 3 | 23.07 | 6 | 46.14 | 3 | 23.07 |
| Approve arrangement of lighting equipment | 13 | 100.00 | | | | | | |
| Hunt for sound effects | 7 | 53.84 | 2 | 15.38 | 2 | 15.38 | 2 | 15.38 |
| Hunt for recorded music | 8 | 61.53 | 2 | 15.38 | 2 | 15.38 | 1 | 7.69 |
| Draw, paint, letter or print cards or graphics | | | 2 | 15.38 | 2 | 15.38 | 9 | 69.22 |
| Plan or design special graphics materials | 1 | 7.69 | 3 | 23.07 | 4 | 30.76 | 5 | 38.45 |

## TABLE XXXII (CONTINUED)

| Work Activities | A NORMAL responsibility for all directors at this station |  | A NORMAL responsibility for some directors but not for all |  | NOT A NORMAL responsibility for ANY director but is sometimes done by a director |  | NOT DONE by any of of our directors |  |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| Help prepare special graphics materials | 1 | 7.69 | 1 | 7.69 | 3 | 23.07 | 8 | 61.53 |
| Plan or design special studio effects | 5 | 38.45 | 1 | 7.69 | 4 | 30.76 | 3 | 23.07 |
| Do make-up for talent | 1 | 7.69 |  |  | 3 | 23.07 | 9 | 69.22 |
| Check for faults in production materials and arrangements | 13 | 100.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Plan budgets for his own productions | 2 | 15.38 | 3 | 23.07 | 2 | 15.38 | 6 | 46.14 |
| Fill out reports and forms relating to his productions | 10 | 76.91 |  |  | 1 | 7.69 | 2 | 15.38 |
| Instruct talent regarding on-camera techniques | 13 | 100.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Instruct talent regarding speaking for TV | 12 | 92.30 |  |  | 1 | 7.69 |  |  |
| Instruct talent regarding acting for TV | 8 | 61.53 | 2 | 15.38 | 3 | 23.07 |  |  |
| Select or supervise selection of TV teacher |  |  | 2 | 15.38 | 2 | 15.38 | 9 | 69.22 |
| Audition and select cast members or talent | 4 | 30.76 | 4 | 30.76 | 2 | 15.38 | 3 | 23.07 |
| Audition and select musicians | 3 | 23.07 | 4 | 30.76 |  |  | 6 | 46.14 |
| Be able to read music |  |  | 4 | 30.76 | 4 | 30.76 | 5 | 38.45 |
| Operate switcher | 11 | 84.60 | 1 | 7.69 | 1 | 7.69 |  |  |
| Operate TV projection equipment | 2 | 15.38 | 1 | 7.69 | 4 | 30.76 | 6 | 46.14 |
| Thread film into a motion picture projector | 3 | 23.07 |  |  | 6 | 46.14 | 4 | 30.76 |

## TABLE XXXII (CONTINUED)

| Work Activities | A NORMAL responsibility for all directors at this station |  | A NORMAL responsibility for some directors but not for all |  | NOT A NORMAL responsibility for ANY director but is sometimes done by a director |  | NOT DONE by any of of our directors |  |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| Operate TV camera |  |  | 1 | 7.69 | 8 | 61.53 | 4 | 30.76 |
| Align TV camera |  |  |  |  | 1 | 7.69 | 12 | 92.30 |
| Warm up TV cameras |  |  |  |  | 2 | 15.38 | 11 | 84.60 |
| Recognize cause of faults in quality of camera picture | 4 | 30.76 | 1 | 7.69 | 7 | 53.84 | 1 | 7.69 |
| Operate video controls (shader, etc.) |  |  |  |  | 1 | 7.69 | 12 | 92.30 |
| Operate audio console |  |  |  |  | 5 | 38.45 | 8 | 61.53 |
| Operate still camera | 2 | 15.38 | 2 | 15.38 | 5 | 38.45 | 4 | 30.76 |
| Develop and print photographs |  |  | 1 | 7.69 | 3 | 23.07 | 9 | 69.22 |
| Operate motion picture camera |  |  | 3 | 23.07 | 6 | 46.14 | 4 | 30.76 |
| Edit and splice motion picture film | 2 | 15.38 | 2 | 15.38 | 7 | 53.84 | 2 | 15.38 |
| Operate audio tape recorders | 4 | 30.76 | 1 | 7.69 | 4 | 30.76 | 4 | 30.76 |
| Operate video tape recorders | 1 | 7.69 | 1 | 7.69 | 1 | 7.69 | 10 | 76.91 |
| Edit video tape | 1 | 7.69 | 2 | 15.38 |  |  | 10 | 76.91 |
| Serve as floor manager |  |  |  |  | 8 | 61.53 | 5 | 38.45 |
| Serve as floor helper (boom, lights, cable, props, etc.) |  |  |  |  | 7 | 53.84 | 6 | 46.14 |
| Do off-camera announcements |  |  | 2 | 15.38 | 10 | 76.91 | 1 | 7.69 |

## TABLE XXXII (CONTINUED)

| Work Activities | A NORMAL responsibility for all directors at this station | | A NORMAL responsibility for some directors but not for all | | NOT A NORMAL responsibility for ANY director but is sometimes done by a director | | NOT DONE by any of our directors | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| Do on-camera announcements | | | 2 | 15.38 | 7 | 53.84 | 4 | 30.76 |
| Serve as interviewer, moderator, program host, etc | | | 1 | 7.69 | 8 | 61.53 | 4 | 30.76 |
| Serve as actor | | | | | 8 | 61.53 | 5 | 38.45 |
| (Work activities written in by respondents. N=number of stations responding to each item.) | | | | | | | | |
| Finding and indexing still pictures for library (N=5) | | | 1 | | 2 | | 2 | |
| Finding and indexing film clips for library (N=5) | | | 1 | | 2 | | 2 | |
| Finding and indexing slides for library (N=5) | | | 1 | | 2 | | 2 | |
| Ordering and care of production supplies (N=4) | | | 2 | | 1 | | 1 | |
| Handling traffic records (N=4) | | | 1 | | | | 3 | |
| Ordering and keeping records on tapes and films (N=4) | | | 1 | | 1 | | 2 | |
| Training student personnel used at the station (N=4) | | | | | 2 | | 2 | |
| Set up and host meetings of school personnel (N=4) | | | | | 1 | | 3 | |
| Conduct tour groups through the station (N=10) | | | | | 6 | | 4 | |
| Train cameramen (N=4) | | | | | 2 | | 2 | |
| Serve as panel member (N=4) | | | | | 2 | | 2 | |
| Serve as puppeteer (N=4) | | | | | 1 | | 3 | |

# CHAPTER V

## ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

The purpose of this chapter is to present an examination, analysis, and discussion of the collected data reported in Chapter IV. The divisions of this chapter are as follows: the critical incidents; statements of critical requirements; the personal data pertaining to the directors; and the job duties of directors.

### A. The Critical Incidents.

In the collection of data it was possible to obtain incidents from twelve of the thirteen station managers and from the assistant station manager who was essentially the operational head of the thirteenth station. Table II shows that 62.5% of the total number of incidents came from managers, and there was an average of 16.1 incidents reported per manager. The average number of incidents per respondent for other management personnel was very much less. The reader should not conclude, however, that managers tend to recall more incidents than program directors, production managers or other officials are able to recall. The higher average number of incidents per manager was probably due to the fact that the greatest effort to elicit incidents was concentrated on the managers. Reference to the criteria for success in the ETV directing job and to the criteria for those who would supply incidents will remind the reader that a maximum amount of data from top management was desired. Below the level of station manager the average number of incidents recalled did not vary greatly in range.

Table III is the tabulation that provides the greatest amount of detail as to how the 310 incidents were distributed among the various categories and sub-categories. Percentages were not computed for the sub-categories because in most cases such percentages would be quite small. The division into good incidents and bad incidents is shown. This dichotomous classification refers to the respondent's identification of an incident as being an instance of unusually effective or unusually ineffective behavior.

When the distribution of indicents among the 14 main categories is examined one of the first questions to be considered is that of whether or not the numbers can be regarded as anything more significant than a chance distribution. Inspection will reveal a substantial range in the number of incidents assigned to main categories, and this range seem too great to occur by chance. However, the chi-square statistic was employed to test a null hypothesis, and the result is shown in Table XXXIII.

Table XXXIII shows the result of using chi-square to test the null hypothesis. The test shows that the probability of the obtained distribution of incidents having occurred by chance is very slight indeed (P is less than .001). Therefore, it seems quite safe to assume that some of the critical behaviors identified are more commonly involved than others in the incidents recalled by management. The frequency distribution of incidents among the main categoreis can now be considered ~~to be~~ of significance.

Before the reader makes any generalizations about the qualities and areas of competence needed by ETV directors a cautioning thought should be expressed. It should be recalled that the measure of success used in this study was management's judgment that a director had behaved at a high level or at a low level of effectiveness in a described situation. In one sense this is an analysis of information that has come to the attention of management. Some behaviors, abilities or characteristics might seldom or never be

## TABLE XXXIII

## DISTRIBUTION OF CRITICAL INCIDENTS AMONG THE MAIN CATEGORIES

| Categories | Number of incidents | Per cent of the total incidents |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Proficiency in working with others | 96 | 30.96 |
| 2. Attitude toward the job | 46 | 14.83 |
| 3. Effectiveness in planning or achieving communication through television | 40 | 12.58 |
| 4. Organization or planning of procedures and details | 26 | 8.38 |
| 5. Reliability in the handling of details | 24 | 7.74 |
| 6. Punctuality | 14 | 4.51 |
| 7. Knowledge of television equipment and television production materials | 13 | 4.19 |
| 8. Quick and calm thinking | 12 | 3.87 |
| 9. Inter-personal communication | 11 | 3.54 |
| 10. Application of station policies | 9 | 2.90 |
| 11. Understanding and application of educational aims, principles, or viewpoint | 8 | 2.58 |
| 12. Attitudes of self-regard | 4 | 1.29 |
| 13. Honesty | 4 | 1.29 |
| 14. Cleanliness and neatness | 3 | .96 |
| Total | 310 | 99.62 |

$X^2 = 367.47$ df = 13 P is less than .001

identified through use of the critical incident technique. For example, a certain level of understanding of television equipment may be common to nearly all directors. Minor variations in the depth of this understanding may seldom become known to management. Therefore, knowledge of television equipment may not often be a factor in critical incidents. Nevertheless, it would be a serious mistake to assume that ETV directors need not understand TV equipment in order to give satisfaction on the job. The reminder should be that behaviors showing small frequencies and even non-critical behaviors may still be important qualities for ETV directors. This research shows, however, that such characteristics fall far down the scale of inportance when judged solely by the criterion used in this critical incident study.

The impressive number of incidents (96 or 30.96%) that involved proficiency in working with others indicates that characteristic to be the one of truly outstanding importance in the ETV directing job. Attitude toward the job (46 incidents) and effectiveness in planning or achieving communication through television (40 incidents) rank far below the number one category but still show large frequencies. After this point there was another distinct drop in frequencies down to 26 incidents involving organization or planning of procedures and details. Twenty-four incidents involved reliability in the handling of details. From this plateau there was another drop to 14 incidents involving punctuality. Thereafter, a gradual diminution is evident in the category frequencies.

Table III shows for each category and sub-category the breakdown of incidents into the classifications of good and bad. Table XXXIV was prepared to show good and bad incident totals for the main categories and to facilitate examination of the distributions. It will be observed that in some categories the good-bad division is approximately even. In other categories the distributions are highly skewed. It would be useful to know whether the proportions of the good-bad divisions are really typical of the characteristics described in the categories or if the distributions are due to chance. The chi-square test of independence was employed to provide an answer to this question, and the result is shown in Table XXXIV.

Table XXXIV shows the results of using chi-square to measure the probability that the distribution of good and bad incidents is independent of the categories into which incidents were classified. The test shows probability to be less than .001, and the hypothesis of independence is rejected. It can be said, therefore, that the distribution of good and bad incidents depends on the categories involved. Another way of stating this relationship would be to say that the several categories of behavioral incidents will tend to show distinctive distributions of good and bad incidents. For example, incidents involving attitude toward the job as the critical behavior will probably tend to occur more often as good incidents than as bad incidents. Incidents involving punctuality of the director will probably tend to occur more often as bad incidents than as good incidents. Some such directional generalization could be made about each category. The reasons for a distinctive distribution pattern may differ with each category and may sometimes be simple and obvious and at other times complicated and difficult to identify.

The good-bad distributions may be interpreted as indicating the strong and weak points of the group of directors in the sample of stations. The predominant strength would seem to be in attitude toward the job, because

## TABLE XXXIV

## DISTRIBUTION OF GOOD AND BAD CRITICAL INCIDENTS ACCORDING TO MAIN CATEGORIES

| Categories | Number of good incidents | Per cent of good incidents (N = 139) | Number of bad incidents | Per cent of bad incidents (N = 171) | Total number of incidents |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Proficiency in working with others | 51 | 36.69 | 45 | 26.31 | 96 |
| 2. Attitude toward the job | 33 | 23.74 | 13 | 7.55 | 46 |
| 3. Effectiveness in planning or achieving communication through television | 21 | 15.10 | 19 | 11.03 | 40 |
| 4. Organization or planning of procedures and details | 11 | 7.91 | 15 | 8.71 | 26 |
| 5. Reliability in handling of details | 6 | 4.31 | 18 | 10.45 | 24 |
| 6. Punctuality | 1 | .71 | 13 | 7.55 | 14 |
| 7. Knowledge of TV equipment and TV production materials | 4 | 2.87 | 9 | 5.26 | 13 |
| 8. Quick and calm thinking | 7 | 5.03 | 5 | 2.91 | 12 |
| 9. Inter-personal communication | 1 | .71 | 10 | 5.84 | 11 |
| 10. Application of station policies | 1 | .71 | 8 | 4.68 | 9 |
| 11. Understanding and application of educational aims, principles, or viewpoint | 2 | 1.43 | 6 | 3.49 | 8 |

TABLE XXXIV (CONTINUED)

| Categories | Number of good incidents | Per cent of good incidents (N = 139) | Number of bad incidents | Per cent of bad incidents (N = 171) | Total number of incidents |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 12. Attitudes of self-regard | 1 | .69 | 3 | 1.75 | 4 |
| 13. Honesty | 0 | | 4 | 2.33 | 4 |
| 14. Cleanliness and neatness | 0 | | 3 | 1.75 | 3 |
| Total | 139 | 99.92 | 171 | 99.61 | 310 |

$X^2 = 47.17$ df = 9 P is less than .001

Note: Categories with cell values of less than 5 were combined for the purpose of the chi-square test of independence. The degrees of freedom became 9 in number rather than 13.

good incidents greatly outnumber bad incidents in that category. Predominant weaknesses appear to be in reliability in handling details, punctuality, inter-personal communication, and application of station policies. It should be recognized, however, that the patterns of good-bad distribution may be due entirely or in part to a tendency for bad behaviors of certain kinds to come to the attention of management more often than do the good behaviors. In other behavioral areas the reverse may be true. Is a good-bad distribution pattern indicative of a general strength or weakness among directors or of the "noticeability" of the behavior? Unfortunately, we do not know. Nevertheless, the importance of a characteristic for success in the directing job is in no way lessened by our lack of positive information about the reasons for the good-bad distribution pattern.

A plan for the logical grouping of main categories seemed likely to increase the serviceability of the results as they might apply to curriculum building, student counseling, personnel selection, or employee improvement. The incident categories were divided into (1) those involving personal qualities and (2) those involving professional knowledge and competence. Table XXXV shows the result of that grouping.

The two groups seemed to be logical and meaningful divisions for the categories. Those behaviors in which personal qualities were the critical element were independent of professional knowledge or skills peculiar to television or education. They were in no way necessarily the result of specific training in television, although those qualities may have been developed in an environment of television training or experience. The behaviors in which professional knowledge or competence was the critical element did involve knowledge or abilities peculiar to television or education.

## TABLE XXXV

## MAIN CATEGORIES OF INCIDENTS CLASSIFIED AS INVOLVING EITHER PERSONAL QUALITIES OR PROFESSIONAL KNOWEDGE AND COMPETENCE

| Categories | Number of incidents | Per cent of the total incidents |
|---|---|---|
| A. Involving personal qualities: | | |
| 1. Proficiency in working with others | 96 | |
| 2. Attitude toward the job | 46 | |
| 5. Reliability in the handling of details | 24 | |
| 6. Punctuality | 14 | |
| 8. Quick and calm thinking | 12 | |
| 9. Inter-personal communication | 11 | |
| 12. Attitudes of self-regard | 4 | |
| 13. Honesty | 4 | |
| 14. Cleanliness and neatness | 3 | |
| Sub-total | 214 | 69.03 |
| B. Involving professional knowledge and competence: | | |
| 3. Effectiveness in planning or achieving communication through television | 40 | |
| 4. Organization or planning of procedures and details | 26 | |
| 7. Knowledge of television equipment and television production procedures | 13 | |
| 10. Application of station policies | 9 | |
| 11. Understanding and application of educational aims, principles, or viewpoints | 8 | |
| Sub-total | 96 | 30.96 |
| Total | 310 | 99.99 |

Such background would ordinarily have been developed during training, through self education, or on the job.

When dividing the categories the group involving professional knowledge and competence was favored in case of doubt. Obviously the largest sub-total of incidents was to occur in the classification involving personal qualities. The more conservative action seemed to be that of influencing in the direction of a normal distribution by favoring the group with the smaller sub-total. Actually, the only category that had to be assigned on the basis of such a decision was "Organization or planning of procedures and details" (26 incidents). This was assigned to the group involving professional knowledge and competence. Good arguments could be advanced for placing this category among those involving personal qualities. Any reader who favors the latter choice would want to regard the sub-total for the personal qualities group as being 26 incidents larger.

Table XXXV shows 69% of the incidents as involving personal qualities and 30.9% as involving professional knowledge or competence. Better than two out of three of the incidents that came to the attention of ETV station management were personal qualities of the kind that a student or a teacher _might_ feel are rather incidental to success as a director. There is no implication that professional knowledge and competence in the area of television, or even in education, are unimportant for successful employment. However, this research seems to leave no doubt that the director's personal qualities will have more to do with the impression he creates with management than will his professional knowledge and skill.

## B. Statements of Critical Requirements.

One of the purposes of this research was to develop a list of critical requirements for success as a director in an educational television station. Having employed the critical incident technique after the manner recommended by Flanagan and others, it is now possible to construct a list of requirements based on the categories and sub-categories detailed in Table III. Regardless of the original distributions of good and bad incidents, all the requirements are stated as effective behaviors. This list of requirements includes the qualities and behaviors which an ETV director should demonstrate on the job if he is to be judged effective by management personnel similar to those supplying data for this study.

1. An effective director is proficient in working with others.
    a. He exercises tact and finesse in handling potentially difficult people or awkward situations.
    b. He stimulates the cooperation and enthusiasm of those with whom he works.
    c. He controls his temper well and does not react unpleasantly in irritating situations.
    d. He is considerate and thoughtful of others.
    e. He accepts criticisms and suggestions gracefully and tries to profit from them.
    f. He is successful in maintaining effective control and discipline over the people he supervises.
    g. He maintains appropriate and discrete personal relationships with others who are involved in station activities.

    h. He has no problems in accepting instructions from persons who are acting within their authority.
    i. He is a good judge of the suitability of a person for a particular job and of the readiness of an individual to do a job with maximum effectiveness.
2. An effective director shows a good attitude toward his job.
    a. He tends to do more than is expected of him and he does this on his own initiative.
    b. He shows no reluctance to undertake whatever job he may be asked to do.
3. An effective director is proficient at preparing content for television presentation and at using the television medium to achieve communication that satisfies the intended objective.
4. An effective director is proficient at planning and organizing details and procedures.
5. An effective director is reliable in the handling of details.
    a. He devotes careful attention to the details involved in on-the-air directing.
    b. He is careful and reliable in the preparation and submission of forms and other paperwork.
    c. He is careful to check such matters as art work; slides; lighting; script; framing of visuals; and videotape numbers in advance in order to discover and correct anything not satisfactory.
    d. He is careful and reliable in following through on all details for which he is responsible.

6. An effective director is punctual.
    a. He meets the deadlines for scripts, forms, and paperwork.
    b. He keeps his production sessions on schedule.
    c. He meets appointments on time.
7. An effective director understands the operation, use, potential and limitations of television equipment and television production materials. This understanding extends to sets and scenery; TV cameras and lenses; lighting; visual and graphic materials; switching equipment; and the television system in general.
8. An effective director should be adept at quick and calm thinking.
    a. He should think quickly and calmly when the unexpected happens during production.
    b. He should think quickly and calmly when deciding on camera shots or camera movement.
9. An effective director is proficient at inter-personal communication.
    a. He achieves effective communication with others during planning and preparation activities.
    b. He is adept at giving effective instructions while a production is in progress.
10. An effective director operates smoothly within the framework of station policies.
    a. He does not exceed the authority of his position.
    b. He follows station policy and procedure in respect to purchases.
    c. He behaves in a manner that contributes to a good station image.
11. An effective director understands educational aims and principles and applies these appropriately in his work.

12. An effective director is self-confident without giving an impression of self-importance.
13. An effective director shows a proper regard for the truth.
14. An effective director is careful about cleanliness and neatness in himself and in the facilities with which he works.

## C. Personal Data Pertaining to Directors.

What kind of people are working as directors in the sample of educational television stations? What background of education and experience do they have? What are their chief complaints about the directing job? What additional training or background do they now wish they had? The answers to these questions and others can be drawn directly from Tables IV through XXXI in Chapter IV. These tables show the tabulations of data collected from all of the 73 persons who were directing full-time or part-time in the 13 ETV stations.

In order to provide a more convenient and summary-type view of the data contained in the 28 tables, a profile of the typical ETV station director has been prepared. The profile includes what appears to be the most typical characteristic from each table, usually a majority condition though in some cases other generalizations are identified. Percentages shown are either taken directly from the tables or are sub-totals of percentages shown in the tables.

On the basis of the data collected from directors in the sample of stations we can say that it is probable that the typical ETV station director has the following characteristics:

1. He is male (93.15%).
2. His job title is producer-director (60.27%).
3. His age is between 25 and 34 years (60.16%).
4. The chances are only slightly better than 50-50 that his assignment is for full-time (50.68%) rather than part-time directing.
5. He serves also as a producer (83.56%).
6. He is likely to have some non-directing duties (58.90%).
7. His non-directing duties may range from teaching down through a long list of non-directing activities and job titles.
8. He has completed four (91.73%) or five (60.23%) years of college.
9. He last attended college during the past five years (60.22%).
10. He has a bachelor's degree (83.54%) and perhaps a master's degree (41.08%).
11. He has completed a college major in broadcasting (67.12%).
12. The last major field he studied in college was broadcasting (65.75%).
13. He has never held paid employment in radio (64.38%).
14. If he did have past employment in radio, it was probably in announcing (23.27%).
15. His starting job at the station where he is now employed was probably producer-director (53.42%) or possibly cameraman (10.95%).
16. He has been at the station of current employment no longer than four years (57.49%).

17. He has served as a director at the station of current employment no longer than three years (57.50%).
18. He has probably had past employment in one commercial television station (52.05%).
19. He has not been employed in any other educational television station (76.71%).
20. The non-directing job in television in which he is most likely to have had experience is that of TV cameraman (39.71%).
21. He has been employed in television no longer than seven years (53.35%).
22. He has had no more than five years of employment experience in TV directing (54.74%).
23. He has had no more than one year of paid employment outside television and radio (57.52%).
24. If he did have past employment outside the field of broadcasting he would likely have been as an unskilled laborer (25.93%) or as a salesman (24.57%).
25. He directs no more than three productions per week (52.02%).
26. He is the producer for all the programs he directs (54.78%).
27. He feels that the least satisfying or least desirable part of the directing job is either working with poorly qualified personnel (24.65%); the paper work that must be done (17.80%); or the shortage of time (12.32%).
28. The additional training or background he would most like to have would be engineering (17.80%); film production (10.95%); psychology (9.58%); music (8.21%); or education (6.84%).

The reader must be warned that the characteristics identified in the profile should not necessarily be interpreted to be desirable standards. It is possible that an atypical condition, far from the one indicated in the profile, may be the most desirable situation both for directors and for the stations that employ them. Obviously many directors do not fit the profile. The profile is merely an approximation of the circumstances that prevailed in the sample stations. It represents an attempt to make the mass of assembled data more conveniently meaningful to the average reader of this report. To more fully realize the range and significance of characteristics among directors in the 13 stations the distributions shown in Tables IV through XXXI must be studied.

It is reasonable to wonder what correlation exists between good and bad incidents and certain descriptive characteristics of directors. For example, does the tendency to be involved in good incidents increase with the age of the director? Does the tendency to be involved in bad incidents decrease with the age of the director? Point-biserial correlations were computed to determine the relationships between involvement in good and bad incidents and six different personal variables. The results are shown in Table XXXVI.

Table XXXVI shows a strong positive correlation between the number of years of TV directing experience and involvement in good incidents. A negative correlation with involvement in bad incidents was considerably lower but still fairly strong. The correlations between involvement in good incidents and the age of the director; years employed in television; years of TV directing; and years at the station of current employment were all significant at the 5% level. Correlations of the personal variables

TABLE XXXVI

POINT-BISERIAL CORRELATION VALUES BETWEEN INVOLVEMENT IN GOOD AND BAD INCIDENTS AND CERTAIN DESCRIPTIVE CHARACTERISTICS OF DIRECTORS

| Characteristic | Good incidents $r_{pb}$ | Bad incidents $r_{pb}$ |
|---|---|---|
| Age of the director | .21 | -.17 |
| Years employed in TV | .37 | -.29 |
| Years of TV directing experience | .61 | -.48 |
| Years at this station | .46 | -.35 |
| Years employed in radio | .10 | -.06 |
| Years employed outside of broadcasting | .06 | -.08 |

with involvement in bad incidents were all negative. In the case of both good and bad incidents, correlations with years of employment in radio and years of employment outside broadcasting were low.

On the basis of the correlations it may be said that the number of years of TV directing experience is a useful indicator of the likelihood of involvement in good incidents. The number of years of employment at the station is a less reliable indicator but still may be regarded as useful.

## D. The Job Duties of Directors.

Table XXXII shows the extent to which certain work activities are normal or usual responsibilities for directors in the 13 stations. Because the four-point scale used in the instrument was sensitive to the exception of even one director, not many items were reported as expected of all directors in a station. Relatively new or inexperienced directors; directors who delegate routine preparatory tasks; and employees who have non-directing titles but do some directing could make up a large body of people who may not fit the usual pattern of what directors do. It is suggested, therefore, that the responses in the column headed, "A normal responsibility for some directors but not for all," be regarded as likely to include cases in which the activity is expected of all fully trained, full time, typical directors.

The work activities indicated as expected of all directors in all stations were as follows:

1. Direct studio productions.
2. Conduct rehearsals.
3. Check for errors in script or copy he is to direct.
4. Describe needs or select set lighting and lighting effects.
5. Approve arrangement of lighting equipment.
6. Check for faults in production materials and arrangement.
7. Instruct talent regarding on-camera techniques.

By combining the frequencies in the column headed, "A normal responsibility for all directors," and the column headed, "A normal responsibility for some directors," a significant identification is accomplished. These duties when added to the list of seven activities included in the previous paragraph complete a list of activities normally expected of some directors but not of all directors. This more extensive list may be nearer to a complete inventory of duties expected of the typical full-time director. The addition of frequencies as suggested above adds the following activities to the list:

8. Consult with talent regarding the materials and methods of presentation.
9. Describe needs or select sets and scenery for his production.
10. Describe needs or select sound effects.
11. Describe needs or select music or musical effects.
12. Describe needs or select special studio effects.

Reference to Table XXXII will reveal that several other work activities failed by only one station response to be included in the "Normal for some directors" list just constructed. It is relevant to observe that in almost any sample of 13 ETV stations some rather unique situations are likely to be encountered. It is quite possible that some unusual practices might be represented in this data, contributing to the spread of frequencies along the scale.

It will be noticed that the checklist was not designed to identify all the other job titles that may be held by persons who do part-time directing. Table V and Table X provide detail on this point.

The write-in items added to the checklist as a result of interviewing did not accumulate significant frequencies from the stations that responded to those specific items. It seems reasonable to conclude that none of the write-in items approach being usual activities for directors.

# CHAPTER VI

# SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

## A. Summary.

Television directing is a complicated, demanding, and challenging job. It is a job to which many young people aspire. Competent directors are vitally important to the future of broadcasting, and one of the most significant areas of need and opportunity for directors is in educational television. Because of the variety, precision, and artistic aspects of the tasks and procedures for which the television director is responsible, directing is one of the most difficult television jobs for which to train students. There has been almost a complete lack of published research concerning the qualifications needed for successful employment as a director in an educational television station. This research was planned to help satisfy that need.

The study was designed to answer three questions concerning directing and directors in educational television stations. These were as follows:

1. What behaviors of directors appear most often as factors in judgments of effectiveness which television station management personnel make concerning their directors?
2. What are the non-behavioral characteristics (such as age, education, and work experience) of the directors who are now employed in a sample group of ETV stations?
3. What job activities are the directors who are now employed in a sample group of ETV stations expected to perform?

Data was collected from management personnel and from 73 directors in a sample of 13 midwestern educational television stations. Personal interviews were conducted in the stations during the autumn of 1966. The critical incident technique was used to gather data which would make possible the formulation of statements of critical requirements for ETV station directors. A personal data form was used to record approximately thirty items of information describing each director's background of education and experience and the nature of his job assignment. A job analysis checklist was devised and used to identify the work activities for which directors in each station were typically responsible.

A total of 310 critical incidents was collected from management personnel. These incidents were classified under 14 main categories and a number of sub-categories, all of which were developed inductively from the data. One category, "Proficiency in working with others," held nearly 31 per cent of the incidents. The next largest category, with nearly 15 per cent of the incidents was "Attitude toward the job." A total of 69 per cent of the incidents involved personal qualities of the director. The remaining 31 per cent of the incidents involved professional knowledge and competence. Use of the chi-square statistic supported the hypothesis that the distribution patterns of good and bad incidents tended to be typical of the characteristics involved. A list of critical requirements was constructed on the basis of the classified incidents.

The personal data pertaining to directors was reported in 28 tables. A 28 point profile of the typical educational television director was also prepared. Point-biserial correlation values between involvement in good and bad incidents and six personal variables were computed. Of the variables tested, the number of years of TV directing experience was revealed to be the best indicator of the likelihood of involvement in good incidents.

The job analysis formprovided an identification of the work activities expected of directors in ETV stations and the extent to which each activity was a normal or usual responsibility for directors in the sample of stations. Twelve activities were identified as normal responsibilities for at least some directors in each of the 13 stations.

## B. Conclusions.

The fundamental purpose of this research was to identify the qualifications that are most important to success in employment as a director in an educational television station. Success was interpreted as a composite of salary raises, promotions, preferential assignments, good recommendations, and a feeling of status . . . the things that might come to a director who is well thought of by management. Appropriate to the critical incident technique, the measure of a director's behavior was the judgment of management as to whether a director has behaved at a high level or at a low level of effectiveness in a described situation. In one sense the critical incident technique provided an analysis of the behavioral information that management in the 13 stations could recall about their directors. Were the behavioral incidents that had come to the attention of management truly the most important and representative things they could know about their directors? The methodology does not provide an answer to that question. However, the critical incident results are no less relevant. Management does tend to make decisions on the basis of existing information and impressions. In a material sense the director's success in the station depends to a large extent on what management thinks of him.

The classification of incidents revealed that an impressive 69 per cent of the incidents involved personal qualities of the director as the critical behavior. Only 30.9% involved professional knowledge and competence as the critical behavior. This is strong evidence that it is the personal qualities that most often determine whether a director is regarded as effective or ineffective at his job. It seems clear that in a training situation definite emphasis should be placed on the development of certain personal qualities.

Proficiency in working with others held a striking lead over all other categories of incidents. Nearly one-third of all the incidents were of this type. Television directing, especially in circumstances surrounding the production of educational and instructional programs, is very much a teamwork activity. The amount of time that the director or producer-director spends working alone is usually greatly exceeded by the amount of time he spends working with other people. Many factors such as the pressures of time, the temperaments of artistic personalities, and overlapping lines of authority lead to irritability and potential friction. The critical incident data supports the conclusion that proficiency in working with others under these trying conditions is the most important personal quality an ETV director can have.

In view of this evidence it would seem that the training situation should provide for the careful evaluation of the student director's personal relationships with all those with whom he has dealings in his production work. When one is directing productions in an ETV station the end does not completely justify the means, and the student director should be made aware of that. In appraising the student's work and in recommending improvements, fully as much importance should be attached to how he works with people as to what kind of a production he achieves. Emphasis on the probable connection between skill in working with people and the likelihood of turning out the best possible programs should not be neglected.

Attitude toward the job, another personal quality, accounted for nearly 15% of the incidents. The greatest number of these involved the director's willingness to do more or devote more time than the expected minimum. Students in training should realize that management's impression of an ETV director is very likely to be influenced by such indications of attitude. Those who feel that the minimum output of time, effort, and enthusiasm is all that should be expected are not likely to do well in an ETV station. Perhaps students should also be reminded that this fact may not be unique to educational television.

Effectiveness in achieving communication through television was the critical behavior in nearly 13% of the incidents and was the highest ranking category in the area of professional knowledge and competence. The frequency of incidents in this category underlines the importance of being able to employ the procedures and materials of television to communicate a given message. This competence goes far beyond the mere understanding of the tools of television. It involves understanding audience interest, motivations, and the learning process. The exercise of this competence may begin during the producing function when the producer-director is developing understanding, perspective, and even selective judgment regarding content. This is followed by the conception of ways in which content can best be communicated through television. Although the advice is not new, these results support the admonition that beginning directors should learn to keep their main critical focus on the achievement of program objectives rather than on the pure mechanics of television production.

Educators who are engaged in training young people who may direct in educational television stations will be interested in the complete list of critical requirements provided in Chapter V. Based directly on the system of categories and sub-categories, the list of critical requirements shows what management people notice and remember. If we assume either that management becomes aware of important behaviors or that the impressions of management are positively related to the "success" of a director in an ETV station, then the list of critical requirements must be regarded as useful information.

From the viewpoint of the director-to-be, one of the most important conclusions to be drawn from the personal data pertaining to directors is that the aspiring director should be prepared to function also as a producer. The data showed that most ETV station directors (83.56%) serve as producers. This suggests that knowing the tools of the production trade is not enough. The producer must plan, organize, and often select content. He needs to be strong in the ability that is referred to in the critical requirements as "Proficiency at preparing content for television presentation and at using the television medium to achieve communication that satisfies the intended objectives." The academic background should be as broad as possible. Skill in working with people outside the field of television becomes additionally important. When the director serves also as a producer he is likely to work with a greater number and variety of people than he would in discharging only the directing function. It seems possible, therefore, that the frequency with which directors serve as producers may help account for the large number of incidents involving proficiency in working with people.

The fact that the majority (58.9%) of directors had some non-directing duties has implications for training. Those who want to devote full time to directing are not being unrealistic. Many such jobs do exist. However, job opportunities and perhaps advancement opportunities are multiplied when the individual is qualified and willing to share his time with activities other than directing. Frequently, employees who have advanced beyond the title of director still do some directing. This leads to the observation that directing is a vital function in an ETV station and one in which an employee may continue to be engaged as he moves up from one position to another. We may tentatively conclude that directing is a core activity which continues as a common factor in the jobs of ETV station employees longer than any other activity in the station. This study did not undertake to test that statement. However, Table X and Table V do provide strong support.

The educational level of directors now working in ETV stations suggests that a bachelor's degree should be regarded as a practical minimum qualification for any person hoping to compete for such employment. More than 83% of the directors interviewed had bachelor's degrees and about 41% held master's degrees. Sixty per cent of the directors reported having finished five or more years of college, although not all of those directors had completed a second degree. The question of why 19% of the directors had not completed a master's degree during five years of (normal load) college work is an interesting one.

Apparently the major in broadcasting has been found to be the most desirable academic background for ETV directors. A major in broadcasting had been completed by 67% of the directors interviewed. The next most common major field, as indicated by the last major field studied, was education, with 8.2% of the cases.

There seems to be definite agreement between the things that directors cited as the least satisfying or least desirable part of the directing job and the categories which held the largest number of bad incidents. The largest number of directors (24.65%) named "Working with poorly qualified personnel" as the most undesirable part of the job. This obviously relates to "Proficiency in working with others," which accounted for the greatest number of bad incidents. "Paperwork to be done" and "Shortage of time" relate to high ranking categories involving details and punctuality. Still other parallels could be drawn. The general agreement in these areas suggests that management tends to be in possession of accurately representative facts concerning situations and behaviors that are trouble spots in the work of directors.

Six different personal variables were tested to determine the correlations with involvement in good and bad incidents. A strong correlation was found to exist between the number of years of television directing experience and involvement in good incidents. The number of years at the station of current employment correlated much less strongly but still at a significant level. We may tentatively conclude from these results (Table XXXVI) that directing experience in typical stations provides a better background for doing well as an ETV director than does a similar period of time devoted to various jobs in the station of current employment. In other words, directing experience tends to be better assurance of success than does general experience (but not all directing) in the station where employed. We may conclude that the ways and means peculiar to a particular ETV station can be learned more quickly than one can acquire the competence that comes through directing experience. This in turn suggests either that ETV stations do not tend to be fundamentally different in ways that affect the director or that adjustment to the differences is not troublesome. The data collected through the use of the job analysis form bears on this subject.

In the 13 ETV stations the job duties of directors were found to be generally alike with few exceptions in the matters that are ordinarily basic to directing (Table XXXII). At the same time differences in other work activities were numerous. Responses to many items were quite evenly distributed from "A normal responsibility for all directors at this station" to "Not done by any of our directors." The distributions of work activities would suggest that training programs in television production are probably no more comprehensive than is needed to prepare students for jobs in ETV directing. As directors in ETV stations they may be expected to do a great variety of things. Versatility and broad familiarity with activities associated with directing and program production will obviously be useful qualifications.

In the final perspective, however, we must observe that the physical work activities with all their range and variety seem to have less to do with the "success" of an ETV station director than does his personal qualities. Perhaps adequate professional knowledge and competencies are more easily acquired than are adequate personal characteristics. Perhaps the dominance of "personal quality incidents" over "professional knowledge and competence incidents" is the result of communication patterns in educational television stations. There may be other explanations. In any case, for the educator, the student, the director, and for station management, there is food for thought in the distribution of critical incidents and in the descriptions of those who are directing in our ETV stations and what they do.

# REFERENCES

Abbot, Waldo and Richard L. Rider, *Handbook of Broadcasting* (4th ed.; New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1957).

Adkins, Gale R., *What Is Important for the Success of a New Employee in Television? Part I. A Study of Statements by Station Managers* (Lawrence: The University of Kansas, 1959).

Adkins, Gale R., *What Is Important for the Success of a New Employee in Television? Part II. A Collection of Statements by Station Managers* (Lawrence: The University of Kansas, 1959).

Adkins, Gale R., *A Study of Job Activities of Directors in Commercial Television Stations* (Lawrence: Radio-Television Research, The University of Kansas, 1961).

Becker, Samuel L. and H. Clay Harshbarger, *Television: Techniques for Planning and Performance* (New York: Henry Holt and Company, Inc., 1958).

Bedwell, Raymond T., *A Study of the Duties and Qualifications of Television Station Directors*. (Unpublished master's thesis, Ohio University, 1955).

Bolen, Murray, *Fundamentals of Television* (Hollywood, Calif.: Hollywood Radio Publishers, Inc., 1950).

*Broadcasting Magazine* Vol. 50, No. 2, (January 9, 1956).

Carnegie Commission on Educational Television, *Public Television: A Program for Action* (New York: Bantam Books, 1967).

Chester, Giraud, Garnet R. Garrison, and Edgar E. Willis, *Television and Radio* (3d ed., New York: Appleton-Century-Crosts, 1963).

Costello, Lawrence and George N. Gordon, *Teach with Television* (New York: Hastings House, 1961).

Diamond, Robert M., *A Guide to Instructional Television* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964).

Ewbank, Henry L. and Sherman P. Lawton, *Broadcasting: Radio and Television* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1952).

Flanagan, John C. "Critical Requirements: A New Approach to Employee Evaluation," *Personnel Psychology*, Vol. 2, 1949.

Flanagan, John C., "The Critical Requirements Approach to Educational Objectives," *School and Society*, Vol. 17, 1950.

Flanagan, John C., "Defining the Requirements of a Research Executive's Job," *Personnel*, Vol. 28, 1952.

Flanagan, John C., "The Critical Incident Technique in the Study of Individuals," *Report of the Seventeenth Educational Conference of the American Council on Education* (New York: Educational Records Bureau, 1952).

Flanagan, John C., "The Critical Incident Technique," *Psychological Bulletin*, Vol. 51 (July, 1954).

Greene, Robert S., *Television Writing* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1952).

Griffith, Barton L. and Donald W. MacLennan (editors), *Improvement of Teaching by Television* (Columbia, Missouri: University of Missouri Press, 1964).

Helton, William B., *A Study of Instruction in Television in Texas Senior Colleges and of Employee Qualifications Sought by Texas Telecasters*. (Unpublished master's thesis, North Texas State College, 1950.)

Hubbell, Richard, *Television Programming and Production* (3d ed.; New York; Rinehart & Company, Inc., 1956).

Kaufman, William I., *How to Direct for Television* (New York: Hastings House, 1955).

Kingson, Walter K., Rome Cowgill, and Ralph Levy, *Broadcasting Television and Radio* (New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1955).

Lawton, Sherman P., *The Modern Broadcaster* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1961).

Lawton, Sherman P., *Employment Facts and Factors at Radio and Television Stations* (Norman: University of Oklahoma, 1961), (mimeographed).

Millerson, Gerald, *The Technique of Television Production* (New York: Hastings House, 1961).

Niven, Harold, *Radio Television Degree Programs in American Colleges and Universities*: *Tenth Report* (Washington, D. C.: National Association of Broadcasters, 1966).

Roulston, Rosaline Jane, *A Survey of the Qualifications of Production Personnel in Television Stations in the United States*. (Unpublished master's thesis, Emerson College, 1953).

Seehafer, Gene F. and Jack W. Laemmar, *Successful Television and Radio Advertising* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1959).

Seltz, Herbert, "The Local Television Director," *Journal of Broadcasting*, Vol. III, No. 2 (Spring, 1959).

Stasheff, Edward and Rudy Bretz, The Television Program: Its Writing, Direction and Production (New York: A. A. Wyn Inc., 1951).

Stasheff, Edward and Rudy Brets, The Television Program (2d ed.: New York: Hill and Wang, 1956).

Stasheff, Edward and Rudy Bretz, The Television Program (3d ed.; New York: Hill and Wang, 1962).

Tyson, Ralph K., The Critical Requirements for the Principalship, A Prospectus Presented to the Graduate School (Athens: The University of Georgia, 1954).

Wagner, R. R., "Using Critical Incidents to Determine Selection Test Weights," Personnel Psychology, Vol. 4, 1951.

White, Melvin R., Beginning Television Production (Minneapolis: Burgess Publishing Company, 1953).

Zettl, Herbert, Television Production Handbook (San Francisco: Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc., 1961).

# APPENDIX

A List of Educational Television Stations in the Sample

Personal Data Form

Job Analysis Checklist

## A LIST OF EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION STATIONS IN THE SAMPLE

Station WSIU-TV
Southern Illinois University
Carbondale, Illinois

Station WTTW
Chicago Educational Television Association
Chicago, Illinois

Station WILL-TV
University of Illinois
Urbana, Illinois

Station KDPS
Des Moines Independent Community School District
Des Moines, Iowa

Station KCSD
School District of Kansas City
Kansas City, Missouri

[1]Station KETC
St. Louis Educational Television Commission
St. Louis, Missouri

Station KUON
University of Nebraska
Lincoln, Nebraska

[2]Station KETA
Oklahoma Educational Television Authority
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma

Station KOKH
Independent School District No. 89
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma

[2]Station KOED
Oklahoma Educational Television Authority
Tulsa, Oklahoma

---

[1] No data collected.

[2] Production facilities are shared.

Station KLRN
Southwest Texas ETV Council
Austin, Texas

Station KERA
Area Educational Television Foundation, Inc.
Dallas, Texas

Station KUHT-TV
University of Houston
Houston, Texas

Station WHA-TV
University of Wisconsin
Madison, Wisconsin

[1]Station WMVS
[1]Station WMTV
Board of Vocational and Adult Education
Milwaukee, Wisconsin

---

[1] Production facilities are shared.

**PERSONAL DATA FORM**
**FOR ETV DIRECTING PERSONNEL**

**RADIO-TELEVISION RESEARCH**
**THE UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS**

Station__________ City__________ Date__________

Last name__________ First__________ Approx. age______

Job title(s)____________________

Directing: Full time______ Part time______ Serve also as producer Yes__ No__

Non-directing duties:

Years of college completed__________ When last attended college?______

19__ Degree__________ College__________ Major______

19__ Degree__________ College__________ Major______

Other formal training____________________

Ever employed in radio? Yes__ No__ How long employed in radio?__________

What jobs in radio?____________________

What was your starting job at this station?__________

Year you began employment here______ How long a producer-director here__

Been employed in other TV stations? Yes_____ No_____

ETV stations__________ Com'l stations__________

TV jobs other than producer-director__________

Total years employed in TV (all stations)__________

Total years of producer-director experience__________

Any other employment besides TV (and radio)? No______ How long total?______

Jobs____________________

How many shows do you direct in a typical week?__________

On how many of these are you both producer-director__________

What part of your (producer-director) job do you feel is least satisfying or least desirable?

What training or background do you sometimes wish you had more of?

JOB ANALYSIS
THE TELEVISION DIRECTOR (ETV STATION)

Conducted by: Radio-Television Research
University of Kansas
Lawrence, Kansas

This is a job analysis of the work of the ETV director. We need to know exactly what directors are expected to do in your station. This analysis also covers the producer-director combination job.

Below is a list of work activities. If our list is compete, it will identify every detail of work that is done by directors in your station. For each item in the list, put a checkmark in the appropriate column at the left to indicate to what extent that activity is a responsibility of your directors.

| NOT DONE by any of our directors | NOT A NORMAL responsibility for ANY director but is sometimes done by a director | A NORMAL responsibility for some directors but not for all | A NORMAL responsibility for all directors at this station | Work Activities |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Direct studio productions.<br>Conduct rehearsals.<br>Direct remote productions.<br>Direct station breaks and announcements.<br>Supervise on-the-air operations during tape or film programs.<br>Direct filming of program segments, news, etc. (film production). |
| | | | | Serve as producer for programs he is to direct.<br>Serve as producer for programs he does not direct.<br>Think up ideas for new programs or series.<br>Serve as production specialist when working with a producer.<br>Consult with talent regarding the materials and methods of presentation.<br>Consult with talent regarding the content of the program. |

| NOT DONE by any of our directors | NOT A NORMAL responsibility for ANY director but is sometimes done by a director | A NORMAL responsibility for some directors but not for all | A NORMAL responsibility for all directors at this station | Work Activities |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Check for errors in script or copy he is to direct. |
| | | | | Edit and make minor changes in script or copy he is to direct. |
| | | | | Prepare run-down sheets or skeleton scripts. |
| | | | | Write announcements or continuity. |
| | | | | Write news copy. |
| | | | | Write special program or special series scripts. |
| | | | | Write documentary scripts. |
| | | | | Plan promotional materials. |
| | | | | Write promotional materials. |
| | | | | Write utilization materials. |
| | | | | Consult with others regarding utilization materials. |
| | | | | Describe needs or select sets and scenery for his production. |
| | | | | Describe needs or select set lighting and lighting effects. |
| | | | | Describe needs or select still pictures. |
| | | | | Describe needs or select films and slides. |
| | | | | Describe needs or select properties. |
| | | | | Describe needs or select on-camera graphics. |

| NOT DONE by any of of our directors | NOT A NORMAL responsibility for ANY director but is sometimes done by a director | A NORMAL responsibility for some directors but not for all | A NORMAL responsibility for all directors at this station | Work Activities |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Describe needs or select sound effects. |
| | | | | Describe needs or select costumes. |
| | | | | Describe needs or select music and musical effects. |
| | | | | Describe needs or select special studio effects. |
| | | | | Give instructions for make-up needed by talent. |
| | | | | Hunt for films, slides or stills for production use. |
| | | | | Screen and prepare films for film programs. |
| | | | | Design sets or scenery. |
| | | | | Help construct sets or scenery. |
| | | | | Help put in place or remove sets. |
| | | | | Assemble props or on-camera materials. |
| | | | | Help arrange lighting equipment. |
| | | | | Approve arrangement of lighting equipment. |
| | | | | Hunt for sound effects. |
| | | | | Hunt for recorded music. |
| | | | | Draw, paint, letter or print cards or graphics. |
| | | | | Plan or design special graphics materials. |
| | | | | Help prepare special graphics materials. |
| | | | | Plan or design special studio effects. |

| NOT DONE by any of of our directors | NOT A NORMAL responsibility for ANY director but is sometimes done by a director | A NORMAL responsibility for some directors but not for all | A NORMAL responsibility for all directors at this station | Work Activities |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Do make-up for talent. |
| | | | | Check for faults in production materials and arrangements. |
| | | | | Plan budgets for his own productions. |
| | | | | Fill out reports and forms relating to his productions. |
| | | | | Instruct talent regarding on-camera techniques. |
| | | | | Instruct talent regarding speaking for TV. |
| | | | | Instruct talent regarding acting for TV. |
| | | | | Select or supervise selection of TV teacher. |
| | | | | Audition and select cast members or talent. |
| | | | | Audition and select musicians. |
| | | | | Be able to read music. |
| | | | | Operate switcher. |
| | | | | Operate TV projection equipment. |
| | | | | Thread film into a motion picture projector. |
| | | | | Operate TV camera. |
| | | | | Align TV camera. |
| | | | | Warm up TV cameras. |
| | | | | Recognize cause of faults in quality of camera picture. |

| NOT DONE by any of our directors | NOT A NORMAL responsibility for ANY director but is sometimes done by a director | A NORMAL responsibility for some directors but not for all | A NORMAL responsibility for all directors at this station | Work Activities |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Operate video controls (shader, etc.). |
| | | | | Operate audio console. |
| | | | | Operate still camera. |
| | | | | Develop and print photographs. |
| | | | | Operate motion picture camera. |
| | | | | Edit and splice motion picture film. |
| | | | | Operate audio tape recorders. |
| | | | | Operate video tape recorders. |
| | | | | Edit video tape. |
| | | | | Serve as floor manager. |
| | | | | Serve as floor helper (boom, lights, cable, props, etc.). |
| | | | | Do off-camera announcements. |
| | | | | Do on-camera announcements. |
| | | | | Serve as interviewer, moderator, program host, etc. |
| | | | | Serve as actor. |
| | | | | Other on-camera performance (describe): |

| NOT DONE by any of our directors | NOR A NORMAL responsibility for ANY director but is sometimes done by a director | A NORMAL responsibility for some directors but not for all | A NORMAL responsibility for all directors at this station | Work Activities |
|---|---|---|---|---|

(Please WRITE IN any additional job titles or work activities which are the responsibility of any of your directors.)

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | |

How many employees in your station devote:
Full-time to directing (or producing-directing)?_____ Part-time to directing (or producing-directing)?_____

YOUR STATION CALL LETTERS______________ CITY______________________________ STATE______________________

RESPONDENT'S NAME________________________________________ TITLE______________________________________